DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 072 374 CG 007 750

AUTHOR	Woodworth, Donald G.
TITLE	The Effects of Laws Governing Youth Employment and School Attendance on Youth Offenses and Delinquency.
INSTITUTION	Stanford Research Inst., Menlo Park, Calif.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO	SRI-P-I-5332
PUB DATE	Dec 65
NOTE	120p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58
DESCRIPTORS	Adolescents; *Child Labor; Delinquency Prevention; Delinquent Behavior; *Delinquent Identification; Employment Opportunities; *Out of School Youth; Research Projects; *School Attendance Laws; *Youth Problems

ABSTRACT

This report deals with three major problem areas--education, employment, and crime--facing the nation and its youth today. Specifically, the report addresses itself to the effects that school attendance laws and child labor laws have on the incidence of youth offenses and delinquency. It was further limited to the investigation of delinquencies in males, ages 12 through 17. Field case studies were conducted in ten locations, followed by literature searches and analysis of statistical data from federal and local agency reports. The study results do not support the hypothesis that a relationship exists among youth offenses and delinquency, compulsory school attendance laws, and child labor laws. Other conclusions of the study were that: (1) Youths' behavior with respect to school attendance and employment was not influenced by child labor and compulsory attendance laws; (2) Youths who are out-of-school and out-of-work are likely to become greater delinquency risks; (3) Enforcement of a child labor law that closes most employment opportunities for youth does not necessarily result in an increase in youth crime; (4) Youth crime does not appear to represent hostile or aggressive acts, such as crime against persons. Recommendations for government action are included that relate to education, employment, and other problems of youth. (Author/SES)

THE EFFECTS OF LAWS GOVERNING YOUTH EMPLOYMENT AND SCHOOL ATTENDANCE ON YOUTH OFFENSES AND DELINQUENCY

STANFORD RESEARCH INSTITUTE
MENLO PARK, CALIFORNIA

OFFICE OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY AND YOUTH DEVELOPMENT
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

CONTRACT NO. JD-65-05

ED 007 750

STANFORD RESEARCH INSTITUTE
MENLO PARK, CALIFORNIA

ED 072371

December 1965

THE EFFECTS OF LAWS GOVERNING YOUTH EMPLOYMENT AND SCHOOL ATTENDANCE ON YOUTH OFFENSES AND DELINQUENCY

Prepared for:

OFFICE OF JUVENILE DELINQUENCY AND YOUTH DEVELOPMENT
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

CONTRACT NO. JD-65-05

By: DONALD G. WOODWORTH

SRI Project I-5332

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

FOREWORD

Background of the Study

The importance and immediacy of the problems of juvenile delinquency and youth offenses in the United States today cannot be overstated. Officials and the general public of the nation are becoming increasingly aware of, and alarmed about, these problems and their implications for the individual, society, and the national economy. The causes and effects of delinquency are many and highly complex. Present knowledge of them is imperfect at best, as is society's ability to prevent or treat either the individual offender or the social phenomenon of delinquency.

In accordance with its interest in ameliorating these problems, the Congress of the United States has recognized the need for research and study of juvenile delinquency to provide a firmer basis for the development and implementation of programs of treatment and correction. This interest was made explicit in the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961, Public Law 87-274, and its subsequent amendments. The following quotation from Section 2 of the act summarizes the problem and states the government's policy of assistance:

a. The Congress hereby finds and declares that juvenile delinquency and youth offenses diminish the strength and vitality of the people of our Nation; that such delinquency and offenses are increasing in both urban and rural communities; that such delinquency and offenses occur disproportionately among school dropouts, unemployed youth faced with limited opportunities and with employment barriers, and youth in deprived family situations; and that prevention and control of such delinquency and offenses require intensive and coordinated efforts on the part of private and governmental interests.

b. The policy of the Federal Government is to assist in developing techniques for the prevention and control of juvenile delinquency and youth offenses, and to encourage the coordination of efforts among governmental and non-governmental educational, employment, health, welfare, law enforcement, correctional, and other agencies concerned with such problems.

In support of these policies, the act authorizes the conduct of several demonstration, research, and assistance projects, the purposes of which are the understanding, prevention, and control of delinquent behavior and youth offenses.

The study reported herein is authorized in Section 8 of the act, Public Law 88-368, an amendment that was passed on July 9, 1964. This section, entitled "Special Study of School Attendance and Child Labor Laws," states in part:

> The Secretary shall make a special study of the compulsory school attendance laws and of the laws and regulations affecting the employment of minors with a view to determining the effects of such laws and regulations on juvenile delinquency and youth offenses.

In November 1964, the Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development and Stanford Research Institute initiated discussions to develop a research design for the study of school and work laws. These discussions resulted in the Institute's submission of a proposal for research on December 4, 1964. On January 8, 1965, a letter contract was received, and work under this authorization began on January 15. Subsequent to further negotiations, a formal contract was signed on April 9, 1965. A chronology of project activity is included in Chapter 1 of the report in the description of the method of approach.

Acknowledgments

Throughout the conduct of the study the project staff has looked to the staff of the Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development for support and guidance. Mr. Bernard Russell, Director of the Office, provided overall guidance from the time of the earliest pre-proposal discussions. Mr. Robert Weber and Mr. Israel Gerver are due special thanks for their continuous support as advisers and for their knowledgeable and thoughtful services in their roles as Project Officers. Miss Sheila Morgenstern of the Office was of great assistance during the early phases of the study in providing liaison between the project staff and various governmental agencies and libraries.

The Institute acknowledges with gratitude the efforts of the many persons who took time from their own busy schedules to serve seriously and constructively as members of the project's Steering Committee and Advisory Committee.

Steering Committee:

Mr. Bernard Russell, Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development

Mr. John Walsh, Department of Labor

Mr. Peter Muirhead, Office of Education

Advisory Committee:

Mrs. Helen Corcoran, Department of Labor

Mrs. Sylvia Weissbrodt, Department of Labor

Miss Dale Kloak, Department of Labor

Miss Beatrice McConnell, Department of Labor

Mr. I. Richard Perlman, Children's Bureau

Mr. August Steinhilber, Office of Education

Mr. James E. Gibbs, Office of Education

Perhaps the study owes its greatest dept to the more than three hundred persons throughout the nation--state officials, heads of local governments, public servants, and interested private citizens--who gave unsparingly of their time and cooperation in the conduct of the field work phases of the study. In all cases the project staff met wholehearted interest and cooperation from the individuals it contacted for interviews or for access to information or statistical data. In many instances access was provided to privileged and confidential records and case files, and all possible attempts have been made to preserve anonymity in the quoted material used in the body of this report.

Numerous members of the Institute's staff took part in the study from its initial design to the completion of this report. Dr. Harry V. Kincaid, senior sociologist and Manager, Behavioral Sciences, was Project Supervisor; Dr. Donald G. Woodworth, psychologist, served as Project Leader. Other staff members who contributed significantly to the study were Gertrude D. Peterson, sociologist; Betty J. Neitzell, psychologist; Edward A. Podesta, behavioral scientist; Dr. Richard Roberts, political economist; Dr. Philip H. Sorensen, senior psychologist; Stephen Stuntz, psychologist; Teresa R. Mousky, research analyst; Ocea C. Goldupp, research analyst.

Several persons are due thanks for their services as consultants to the project during the field data collection activities: Dr. Braxton M. Alfred of Stanford University, Dr. John Del Torto and Robert Caplan of San Francisco State College, Mrs. Jacqueline P. Wiseman of the University of California, and Dr. Jack A. Harrison of San Francisco.

CONTENTS

FOREWORD iii

Part I
Introduction, Conclusions, and Recommendations

1 INTRODUCTION 1

2 CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS 11

Part II
A Survey of the Laws and Delinquency

3 COMPULSORY SCHOOL ATTENDANCE LAWS 17

The Nature of the Laws Governing School Attendance 17
State Laws Governing School Attendance 18
Exemption from Compulsory Attendance Laws 21
Enforcement of Compulsory Attendance Laws 23
Nonlegal Factors Affecting School Attendance 24
Statistics on School Attendance and the Child Population 25

4 THE REGULATION OF CHILD LABOR IN THE UNITED STATES 29

The Laws Governing the Employment of Children 29
Regulation of Youth Employment Under the Fair Labor Standards Act 30
The Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act 33
State Child Labor Laws and Regulations 33
Enforcement of Child Labor Laws 38

5 GENERAL ASPECTS OF THE DELINQUENCY PROBLEM 41

The Nature and Extent of Youth Crime and Offenses 41
Statistics on the Incidence of Youth Offenses 41
Trends in Youth Crime 43
The Structure of Male Delinquency 46

CONTENTS

Part III
Findings and Results of the Field Studies

6 DESCRIPTION OF FIELD STUDIES AND STUDY SITES 49

The Field Studies 49

7 SCHOOL ATTENDANCE AND COMPULSORY EDUCATION LAWS 57

The Attendance Laws 57
School Attendance and Dropouts 60
The Effects of Repeal of School Laws 62
Enforcement of Attendance Laws 65
Exceptions to the Laws 66
Summary 68

8 YOUTH EMPLOYMENT AND CHILD LABOR LAWS 71

Child Labor Laws 71
Enforcement of Child Labor Laws 73
The Employment and Unemployment of Youth 75
Nonlegal Factors Affecting Youth Employment 77
Two Special Cases 79
Summary of the Employment Problems of Youth 80

9 YOUTH OFFENSES AND DELINQUENCY 81

The Incidence of Juvenile Offenses 81
Age and Offenses 85
Types of Offenses by Youth 86
Delinquency and Minority Groups 88
Offense Rates and School and Employment Laws 89

CONTENTS

10 SPECIAL ANALYSES CONCERNING THE RELATIONSHIP OF DELINQUENCY TO SCHOOL ATTENDANCE AND EMPLOYMENT OF YOUTH 93

The Cleveland-Flint-New Orleans Investigations 93
Winston-Salem Delinquents 98

APPENDIX Instructions to Field Work Teams and Listing of Data To Be Collected 101

TABLES

1	Summary Data for Locations Selected for Field Study	8
2	Age Limits for Compulsory School Attendance, by State	19
3	Number of States Specifying Various Minimum Ages for Employment in Major Occupational Groups	36
4	Arrest Trends, by Age	44
5	Arrests of Males Less Than 18 Years Old in the United States	47
6	Summary Data for Locations Selected for Field Study	52
7	Economic Factors in the Study Sites	53
8	Enforcement of School Attendance and Child Labor Laws in the Study Sites	54
9	Constraints on Youth Employment in the Study Sites	55
10	Trends in Delinquency Rates in the Study Sites	56
11	Relationshi, of Attendance Laws to Rate of Dropout of Males in Grades 9 Through 12	61
12	Basic State Minimum Age Provisions for Employment in the Study Sites	72
13	Estimated Incidence of Male Delinquency in the Ten Field Study Sites	82
14	Age Distribution of Male Police Contacts, by Study Site	86
15	Male Police Contacts, by Type of Offense and Study Site	87
16	Delinquency Rates and Legal Ages for School Attendance and Employment, by Study Site	90

PART I INTRODUCTION, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

The United States is currently facing and attempting to find solutions to a multitude of pressing and important social and economic problems. This report deals with three major problem areas facing the nation and its youth--education, employment, and crime. Specifically, the report addresses itself to the effects that school attendance laws and child labor laws have on the tendencies of young people to engage in unlawful and antisocial acts.

Other important problems face the nation's youth, but the scope of the present study required delimitation to only the problem areas noted above. Also, it is well known that a multiplicity of other factors besides school and employment contribute to delinquency. Theory and research concerning the "causes" of juvenile delinquency have long ago demonstrated that the etiology of delinquent behavior is highly complex and individualized.

Objectives

The overall objectives of the research were:

1. To investigate the extent and nature of legal constraints on the entry of youths into the labor force.

2. To investigate the extent and nature of legal constraints on voluntary leaving of school by youths before high school graduation or the equivalent.

3. To analyze the relationships that exist between such constraints and juvenile delinquency and youth offenses.

Of particular interest was the investigation of the effects of such legislation, regulation, and practice on the behavior patterns of youths whose desires run counter, i.e., youths who seek to leave school or to begin work before attainment of minimum ages.

Scope

Only ten months were available from the start of work until the deadline for submission of the draft of the report; thus, it was necessary to impose certain rigorous bounds on the breadth and depth of the study.

Study Sites

It was determined that no more than ten field locations could be investigated with sufficient thoroughness to provide reliable data within the time and fiscal limits of the study. The field study sites were selected with the hope that generalizations concerning the objectives of the study made on the basis of these ten field studies would not be likely to misrepresent seriously the national situation.

Sex

The study was limited to the investigation of male delinquency. Juvenile girls account for very few of the problems in the topic areas under study. In the area of juvenile crime, girls contribute only a small fraction of the total number of arrests of persons less than 18 years of age. According to the Uniform Crime Reports, the 1962 and 1963 distributions of arrests of persons less than age 18, by sex, are as follows:

	Percent of Total Arrests	
	1962	1963
Boys	84.91%	84.71%
Girls	15.09	15.29
Total	100.00%	100.00%

If only the more serious criminal activity (i.e., felonies) is considered, the picture is even more clearly defined. Girls account for only about 10 percent of the serious crimes for which juveniles are arrested. In general, girls appear in the FBI arrest statistics primarily for the following types of crime: petty larceny, disorderly conduct, sex (other than prostitution), liquor law violations, vagrancy, and drunkenness.

Girls also differ from boys in terms of conflict with the compulsory school attendance laws. Only a relatively small proportion of girls voluntarily drop out of school before high school graduation. Although the overall "dropout rates" for boys and girls may appear to be similar in many cases, analysis of the causes or reasons for dropout demonstrates that a large proportion of the girls leave school either because of pregnancy or marriage. Since in most school districts either of these reasons is cause for exemption or exclusion from the school system, it cannot properly be said that these girls are voluntarily acting in conflict with the compulsory attendance laws. In many school systems the data on girl dropouts include all reasons and causes in aggregated statistics; thus, the data for girls are often hopelessly confused if one wishes to study the voluntary dropout.

Another point concerns the likelihood that child labor laws may influence the behavior of girls; most girls in the juvenile age range are not oriented toward entry into the labor force as a career. Furthermore, the child labor laws, especially those of the states, applicable to girls are in some cases quite different from those for boys. The attempt to include these variations in the analyses would have greatly complicated the issue with little hope for a valuable return.

Age Range

Except for a few situations, which are individually noted, the research has focused on the problems of the male population from ages 12* through 17 for two reasons: (1) no state requires school attendance by children of age 18 or above; (2) 18 is usually the upper age limit for coverage by child labor laws and regulations. Also, in all states except California, the age range over which juvenile courts have jurisdiction is age 17 and younger. Even in California, where the jurisdictional age is 21, by statute, the practice of juvenile courts in treating defendants age 18 and older is to bind them over to the superior courts for disposition. Thus, the portion of the population older than 17 is generally beyond the scope of the school and work laws under consideration, and persons beyond this age are no longer, legally, juvenile offenders, but are considered adults.

The lower limit on the age range was established for two reasons. First, children age 11 and younger (equivalent to fifth grade in school) usually are not in serious conflict with either the compulsory attendance or child labor laws. Second, the number and nature of offenses committed by children in the lower age ranges suggests age 12 to be a meaningful lower bound. According to the FBI statistics, about 30 percent of all juvenile arrests are of persons age 14 or younger; and data collected in the study indicate that only about 10-15 percent of police contacts for delinquency are with children younger than 12. Furthermore, these data indicate that only a minor proportion of the under-12 contacts are for offenses that can truly be classed as "crime"; most of these contacts are for such offenses as "not coming home on time," curfew violation, larceny--bicycle theft, and truancy.

Method of Approach

The original statement of the problem as formulated in the delinquency control act, specified the variables to be investigated in the

---

* The Children's Bureau, in its Juvenile Court Statistics, considers age 10 to be the lower bound of "the child population at risk." However, the data collected in the present study indicate that age 12 is a more useful cut-off for the research purposes of this study.

study: (1) compulsory school attendance laws, (2) child labor laws, and (3) the incidence of delinquency.

However, preliminary study of state laws and regulations indicated that little variation exists in either the compulsory school attendance or child labor laws and also that, even when such variation does exist, this variation is unrelated to the actual behavior of youth; that is, higher age limits for school attendance or employment do not necessarily result in higher school attendance rates or lower employment rates among youth younger than the legal ages.

These preliminary findings led to the hypothesis that factors other than the existence of laws are influential in determining such youth behavior. Therefore, the problem statement was recast so that the study would examine not only the laws, but also factors related to local policy, practice, implementation, and enforcement of the laws and regulations.

Another problem that strongly influenced the final design and conduct of the study was the nonavailability of comparable nationwide statistics on the criminal behavior of youth. This problem is discussed in detail later, but it should be noted that, since there are no age- and location-specific data on the extent and nature of youth offenses for the nation as a whole, cross-comparisons between specific localities are impossible.

Basic Design of the Study

Ten locations were selected for field-case study; it was believed, because of the scope and complexity of the information required and the difficulty of gathering appropriate data, that intensive study of a smaller number of localities would be more effective than would a cursory survey of a larger sample.

In addition to the case study approach, other methods were employed at various stages of the research, as appropriate; e.g., a literature search was conducted, and statistical data and other materials from the published reports of federal and local agencies were collected and analyzed.

The study was conducted in four phases.

Phase I

From January 15, 1965, to February 15, 1965, the project management prepared detailed staffing plans; assigned responsibilities to the staff for later activities; and developed detailed time and data collection schedules for the entire study. Meetings were held between the project staff and the Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development;

details of the proposed research plan were discussed and agreed upon, and various sources of required data were considered, as were problems likely to be encountered in assembling the desired information.

Phase II

Phase II began in February and was largely concluded by the end of April 1965, but some of this work continued throughout the study. The work of this phase consisted of the following:

Literature Review. This review covered all of the standard bibliographic sources and also included the collection of a large number of documents relating to regional or community "action programs" in the field of youth development and delinquency control.

The literature in the fields of delinquency, youth unemployment, school attendance, and youth problems in general is voluminous (e.g., the triennial International Bibliography on Crime and Delinquency alone lists some 4,000 new sources each year). No attempt was made to conduct an exhaustive review of all literature in the field; standard works and bibliographic sources were reviewed in the attempt to identify those sources that contained material relating to the study.

Little in the published literature has dealt even indirectly with the specific problems at hand. Therefore, no attempt is made in the report to present a general review of the literature; rather, reference is made to relevant works at appropriate points in the report.

Summary and Collation of School Attendance and Child Labor Legislation. The project staff collected materials relating to the characteristics of the compulsory school attendance laws and laws regulating work by, and the employment of, minor children. Published and unpublished documents covering these laws supplied by the Office of Education and Department of Labor representatives on the project Advisory Committee were of greatest help.

These source materials provided detailed background information, which was analyzed for presentation in this report. These analyses were also prepared for use in developing plans for the conduct of later phases of the research and for use in the selection of specific sites for field studies.

Particular attention was paid to analysis of the interrelationships of the school attendance and child labor laws and regulations. Also of special interest was the identification of unusual regulations, legal exception and exemption procedures, types of coverage, etc., which would make particular localities, classes of persons, or types of work of special interest to the study.

Survey of the Incidence of Youth Offenses and Delinquency. Only two basic sources exist which present the status of youth crime and delinquency for the nation as a whole: the Uniform Crime Reports published annually by the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and the Juvenile Court Statistics published by the Children's Bureau of the Welfare Administration. These and other documents (e.g., reports of some state level agencies) were surveyed, and an attempt was made to summarize the various data into a form that would present a coherent picture of the incidence and rates of youthful offenses for the nation and for the individual states.

The data were collected to form the basis for a general study of the incidence of delinquency versus other data collected during this phase, such as variations in school and work laws. The data on differential delinquency rates were also required for the process of selection of study sites.

Analysis of U.S. Census Data. An analysis of detailed population and demographic information for the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico was made to (1) develop a systematic description of the national state of affairs relating to school attendance and labor force participation by youths within the age ranges covered by legislation; (2) observe the degree to which states vary with respect to the apparent rigor of enforcement of the minimum age laws for school attendance and work; and (3) develop demographic data necessary for the selection of locations for the field studies.

The base year 1960 was used in these analyses, since the decennial census was the only reliable, comprehensive source of information available on the detailed characteristics of the youth population. In a few cases it was possible to update data to 1962 or 1963 from information supplied by such documents as Special Labor Force Reports. Most of the analyses were conducted for the population of youths in the 14 through 17 year age range.

Analyses of the census data were also undertaken for a number of cities, counties, and Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas (SMSAs). These results aided in the selection of the specific locations for the field studies.

Phase III

This phase comprised the preparation for, and conduct of, a meeting between project staff and the Advisory Committee, held on April 28, 1965, at the Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development to discuss the status of the research and reach final decision on the ten sites to be studied in the field work.

At the meeting the project staff presented a set of candidate locations--either cities or counties--that it considered likely sites for the conduct of the field studies, and ten study sites were selected that would provide reasonable variance on such relevant parameters as:

1. Geographical location.
2. Urban-rural population mix.
3. Ethnic-racial population mix.
4. School attendance rates.
5. Rates of labor force participation by youth.
6. Youth offense and delinquency rates.
7. Youth unemployment rates.
8. Overall social and economic condition of the locale.

Other information not suitable for direct statistical treatment was also considered: the labor force structure of each area with regard to the likely prevalence of job opportunities covered by hazardous occupation regulations; special social or law enforcement problems; and recent changes in local school or child labor laws.

Table 1 lists the ten locations selected. It also contains certain of the data that were considered in making the selections. Many of these data were taken from the 1960 census, since these were the only population statistics available at this stage of the research. The data included in the table are not offered as definitive indices of the variables included. They were used only as "best estimates" of these factors, for they were derived from various sources, some of which were in themselves of unknown reliability. However, they provided a rational basis for the selection of regions that would likely present variation in the parameters.

The demographic data presented in Table 1 may lead some readers to conclude that rural areas are insufficiently represented. However, this balance was purposefully achieved since juvenile crime is primarily an "urban problem"--in 1963 only 7 percent of the delinquency cases in the United States were of rural origin. Accordingly, some rural situations are included, but not so many as to jeopardize the careful analysis of the more serious problems (in terms of both relative and absolute numbers of delinquents) in urban centers.

Phase IV

During the Phase III committee meeting, it was decided that the field work that constituted the major effort of Phase IV would begin in May and that the target date for completion of all field studies would be September 30. The last of the field studies was completed on October 8.

It was agreed that there was a need to learn more about problems that might be expected in the various locations; optimum operating

Table 1

SUMMARY DATA FOR LOCATIONS SELECTED FOR FIELD STUDY
1960 Data Unless Otherwise Noted

Study Site	Total Population	Urban Population as Percent of Total	Legal Data			Male Population, Age 14-17				Unemployment Rates		Delinquency Rate, Male
			Compulsory Attendance Age	Minimum Basic Work Age	Juvenile Court Jurisdictional Age (Male)	Total	Percent Nonwhite	Percent in Labor Force	Percent out of School	Overall	Youth, Male	
Boston (City), Massachusetts	697,197	100. %	16	16	17	18,651	8.9%	31.6%	2.1%	5.0%	8.3%	1.8%
Kanawha County, West Virginia (Charleston)	252,925	66.8	16	16	18	8,524	5.3	15.7	15.0	6.1	14.2	1.3
New Orleans (City), Louisiana	685,050 (1965)	100.	16	16	17	17,902	39.1	16.9	14.2	4.3 (6/65)	n.a.	4.0
Lane County, Oregon (Eugene)	183,806 (1965)	61.1	18	14	18	5,431	0.6	28.9	n.a.	9.0	n.a.	3.3
Flint (City), Michigan	200,000 (1965)	100.	16	14	17	5,209	17.0	28.9	14.3	2.8 (1964)	19.0	0.7
Maricopa County, Arizona (Phoenix)	663,510	86.5	16	14	18	21,605	5.2	33.0	24.0	4.5 (1964)	9.8	5.5
Charleston (City), South Carolina	79,200 (1964)	100.	none	16	18	2,167	54.1	n.a.	n.a.	6.5		n.a.
Oakland (City), California	385,700 (1965)	100.	16	15	18 (21)*	9,098	29.3	24.3	n.a.	9.6 (1964)	11.5	4.2
Cleveland (City), Ohio	811,050 (1965)	100.	18	16	18	21,458	28.3	26.9	9.1	2.3 (6/65)	9.9	1.1
Winston-Salem (City), North Carolina	138,872 (1964)	100.	16	16	16	3,237	42.0	27.7	n.a.	3.8 (5/65)	n.a.	1.4

n.a. = not available.

* Although 21 is the statutory age in California, in the courts, practice is to handle persons 18 years of age and older as adults.

Source: Compiled and calculated by Stanford Research Institute.

procedures for collecting the wide variety of information required from each location; and the sources, forms, and quality of available information. Therefore, it was concluded that the field work would begin in Oakland, California, and that this study would serve as a pilot in developing a model for subsequent field work in the other nine locations. This pilot study highlighted problems that were to be encountered in the field research, such as the numbers of persons and agencies that would have to be contacted in each location (e.g., in Oakland there are over 300 agencies and organizations dealing with youth problems). This experience also indicated that a minimum of 1.5 man-months of effort would be required for completion of each of the field studies.

The work in Oakland also led to the conclusion that no standardized interview schedules or data collection forms were feasible since it was necessary that procedures for the collection of the required information be adaptable to all of the unpredictable situations to be encountered. Accordingly, the field research workers were provided only general guidance, which included a detailed briefing on the purposes of the research and a listing of the types of data and other information that should be collected in each location. A copy of this listing is in the Appendix.

On the basis of original planning, and as modified by the experience gained in the study of Oakland, a series of instructions was developed that formed the operational framework for the field activities of the project teams in the nine study sites; these instructions are in the Appendix.

Many of the data and opinions sought were of a privileged, confidential, or controversial nature; however, it was found that senior officials, when approached on a professional basis, were willing to provide unequivocal support to the research activity. Such support was essential in working with the variety of public agencies that provided the basic information for the study.

During the field studies, attempts were made to collect extensive statistical data concerning the youth of the localities; for example, school records, employment data, and police and court statistics. Most of these data were collected in the form of standard reports and documents prepared by the agencies consulted. However, in a number of cases, such standard materials did not contain data in the form demanded for the study. For example, some statistics on youth did not give necessary cross-tabulations by age, sex, race, etc. In many of these situations, the agencies developed the additional analyses to provide the required breakdown; in other cases, access was provided to confidential files (such as police juvenile contact reports) to enable the study teams to retabulate original data in the required form.

It was also discovered that certain necessary data did not exist at all. For example, in several localities, no population or school census had been taken since 1960, and therefore, no current data were available on the numbers of youth in the population (data required for rate computations).

The experience in the ten study sites supported the early decision to forego the use of standardized data collection forms and procedures. Also, much of the most valuable information in the study resulted from free discussions, which probably would have been inhibited by the use of standard interview formats.

Part of the field work was concerned with the collection of information on the combined school, work, and delinquency behavior patterns of individual youth. It had early been decided that intensive studies of case records of individual offenders would consume a great amount of time and would yield information on only a very small sample of cases. It was also found that in most places records of all three of these types of behavior were not held by any single agency. However, it was possible in several of the field sites to implement a procedure that matched school records, employment records, and police contact records. These analyses permitted a general description of certain broad patterns of interrelationships between school attendance, work, and delinquent behavior for some 260 boys.

At the completion of each of the ten field studies a "Site Study Report" was prepared. Those reports took the form of summary presentations of the significant data, results, and conclusions based on the field study and the impressions of the researchers. The present report contains much of the summarized data collected, and the analyses and conclusions represent the synthesis of the results of the several field studies.*

---

* Copies of these site reports were separately submitted as working papers to the Office of Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Development.

Chapter 2

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Conclusions

The primary conclusions listed below relate directly to the basic aim of the research, i.e., the study of the relationship between school attendance and child labor laws and the incidence of youth offenses and delinquency. The secondary conclusions are more general; these deal with various matters concerning these variables and the problems encountered in the attempt to develop information concerning them.

Primary Conclusions

1. The incidence of youth offenses and delinquency in the locations studied showed no discernible relationships to the existence, nature and structure, or enforcement of compulsory school attendance or child labor laws. However, it cannot be stated categorically that such relationships do not exist. Therefore, the only proper conclusion that may be drawn is that the results of this study provide no support for a hypothesis that any relationship exists among youth offenses and delinquency, and compulsory school attendance laws, and child labor laws.

2. The actual behavior of children with respect to school attendance and employment did not appear to be significantly influenced by the existence, nature and structure, or enforcement of child labor and compulsory school attendance laws. In none of the places studied did the existence or nature of the laws appear to be related to school attendance by children covered by the laws, the problem of school dropouts, or the employment problems of teenage youth.

3. There was some indication from the field study results that, when youths younger than 18 are placed in the situation of being out-of-school and out-of-work, they become higher delinquency risks. In the locations studied, no set of school or work laws was found that would tend to produce this situation, but this hypothesis was advanced by so many informants that it is worthy of attention.

4. Enforcement of a child labor law that closes most employment opportunities for youth does not necessarily result in an increase in youth crime. Delinquency rates were quite low in the

one study site where labor laws so acted on the population younger than 18.

5. The nature of the known crimes committed by youth does not appear to represent hostile or aggressive acts (e.g., crimes against persons), nor do they represent substantial numbers of crimes committed for significant economic gain or crimes committed out of economic need.

Secondary Conclusions

While the following conclusions do not relate directly to the basic objectives of the study, they are offered for their value to the various persons and agencies with interests and responsibilities in the youth work field.

1. The repeal of compulsory school attendance laws in South Carolina and Louisiana did not appear to measurably affect the school attendance behavior of children in these places.

2. School dropouts as a group tend to have higher rates of delinquent acts. However, the times at which their delinquent acts were committed are not related to the time of school leaving. It appears that a pattern of trouble with authority may act as an intervening variable and account for both of these phenomena, and therefore, from these results, no direct causal relationship may be postulated between a tendency to leave school and a propensity for delinquent acts.

3. Youth younger than 18 are at a disadvantage in the competition for employment in all the sites studied. However, only to a slight extent is this situation the result of child labor laws. Rather, it is largely the result of the lack of skills and experience of the youth, of employer attitudes, and of the supply of more mature job applicants with better qualifications. There is a growing tendency for employers to require a high school education for most positions.

4. Most educators, law enforcement officials, and labor and employment officials feel that changes in the compulsory school attendance laws will not ameliorate any of the problems of youth unless there are serious revisions of educational curricula in the public schools to meet the needs of those children who cannot adapt to, and whose needs are not met by, present offerings.

5. Socially, culturally, and economically disadvantaged youth present a pattern of school dropout, unemployment, and delinquency problems disproportionate to their representation in the population in all the sites studied. However, the data collected

preclude a "racial" interpretation of such findings since disadvantaged youths identifiable by national background (e.g., Mexican-American) present problems identical to those of disadvantaged youths identifiable by "racial" background (e.g., Negroes).

A Methodological Conclusion

The SRI project staff was aware from the outset of the study that problems would be encountered in the acquisition of many of the data sought. However, the magnitude of the problem was wholly underestimated. On the basis of the findings in this study, it is possible to state the following conclusion:

> It is not possible, at the present time, even through intensive effort in a highly delimited geographical area to acquire from available statistics reliable and standardized information, by such demographic detail as sex, age, or race, on such basic variables as the following:
>
> - Number of children resident in the community (i.e., census data).
> - Number of children actually in school attendance.
> - Number of children who have dropped out of school.
> - Number of children in the labor force.
> - Number of children employed or unemployed.
> - Number of children who have had formal contact with police agencies or who have been handled by juvenile court or probation authorities.

This does not imply that none of these types of data are available or that the lack of data is in any way the fault of any persons or agencies. Some of these data were available in all places studied, but in none of the study sites were all of these data available. Thus, at the present time the description and analysis of the problems of the nation's youth are very difficult in other than gross and essentially intuitive terms. By definition, this situation also makes impracticable the task of conducting broad nationwide studies of the interrelationships among the problems of youth.

Recommendations

Since it was the finding of this study that no measurable relationships can be demonstrated between delinquency and school and child labor

laws, no recommendations are made for executive or legislative action as a result of this aspect of the study.

However, since the introduction to the basic legislation (the Juvenile Delinquency and Youth Offenses Control Act of 1961) makes it clear that the government's interests in the problems of youth are broad, it seems appropriate to include in this chapter recommendations that relate to the overall problems of education, employment, and other problems of youth, even though they do not relate directly to the primary objective. Therefore, the following are presented as suggestions for action and study to serve the youth of the nation.

1. Development of a National Youth Information System

The dearth of standardized, comparable, and reliable information about the nation's youth and their problems is detrimental to any attempts to understand these problems rationally or to develop plans and programs to deal with them. This situation has equal implication for research activities, for federal and local programs for youth, and for executive and legislative consideration of the problems. It is therefore suggested that the federal government take leadership (1) in the initiation of studies to determine the information needs of all agencies and persons dealing with the youth population of the nation, and (2) in the development of the most feasible approaches to the systematic collection, reporting, and dissemination of these types of information. At this time we are not in a position to suggest an appropriate structure for such a system or the delegation of responsibility for such activity. It is possible that existing agencies of the government could undertake the task, e.g., the Bureau of the Census, Bureau of Labor Statistics, National Center for Educational Statistics, Federal Bureau of Investigation. Each of these agencies has been active in the collection and dissemination of the classes of data of interest, but all have been hampered by the sorts of problems discussed elsewhere in this report, particularly the lack of authority to enforce data collection and reporting by local agencies and jurisdictions.

The system should be so designed and operated as to ensure that basic data such as were described under "A Methodological Conclusion," above, would become available to researchers, planners, and legislators. In the absence of such a systematic method for providing reliable and current information on the youth population, any planning or action must necessarily be made on the basis of estimates and projections of unknown reliability.

2. Development of Standardized Definitions for Youth Statistics

Many of the problems encountered in the present study were the result not only of unavailability of information on youth but also of wide variation in the meaning of available data; this made extremely difficult the task of comparing conditions in the various locations studied. As an example, there are no standard procedures used in all places for calculating

and reporting data on school dropouts. Also, the procedure of using standard systems for classifying crimes (those developed for adult crime) obscures many of the most valuable data on the nature of youth offenses.

Thus, it is suggested that studies be initiated or accelerated to establish standards for the reporting of school attendance and school withdrawal statistics throughout the nation. Similarly, work should be undertaken to develop a system for reporting youth offenses that will adequately reflect the differences among the many types of unlawful and antisocial acts that cause youths to come into contact with the police and the courts.

3. Standardization of Legal and Jurisdictional Ages

The field work pointed up the problems of attempting comparative studies in view of the fact that there are no standard age limits that define "juvenile" for law enforcement purposes. It would be desirable for the federal government, in collaboration with appropriate agencies, to support efforts that will result in the establishment of nationwide standards for the classification of offenders as "juvenile."

A similar suggestion is made with regard to the minimum and maximum age standard in child labor and compulsory school attendance laws. There would seem to be no rational basis justifying differences in the age provisions of these laws between states, and the situation creates confusion in the study of such problems as school dropouts. For example, whether a child is a "legal" or "illegal" school leaver depends on the state in which he resides.

4. Special Studies of Cases of Repeal of Educational Laws

The findings of the New Orleans and Charleston field studies, i.e., that repeal of compulsory school attendance laws did not affect school attendance, suggest that the situations in these cities be the subject of special intensive studies. These studies could develop a much more detailed reconstruction of the histories of these situations and much more detailed evaluations of the results of the legislative acts than was possible here.

5. Changes in Compulsory School Attendance Laws

On the basis of the findings from the field studies, it is suggested that no changes (other than standardization) be encouraged in the age provisions of state compulsory school attendance laws. However, it is suggested that intensive study be made of the special educational needs of "problem youth" and that increasing support by given to the development by local school systems of high school-equivalent programs to meet the needs of these youth. At such time as appropriate and adequate programs

are available to meet the educational needs of all youth, it is suggested that encouragement be given to an increase in compulsory attendance legislation--not to a mandatory age standard, but rather to an educational attainment standard, such as graduation from high school or the equivalent.

6. Special Study of Flint, Michigan, Programs

Flint, Michigan, was found to be an unusual case. In that city there is total community involvement in the amelioration of the problems of youth to an extent probably not to be found elsewhere. These programs, partially sponsored by the Mott Foundation, include wide-ranging and intensive youth services, such as personalized curriculum planning for all potential droupouts and supportive counseling by juvenile police officers assigned permanently to each junior and senior high school. It is suggested that an intensive study and evaluation of these programs be conducted to determine the effectiveness of these efforts and to determine the applicability of these experimental approaches to youth programs in other places.

PART II A SURVEY OF THE LAWS AND DELINQUENCY

Chapter 3

COMPULSORY SCHOOL ATTENDANCE LAWS*

The Nature of the Laws Governing School Attendance

There are no federal laws governing or regulating compulsory school attendance. All such laws are in state statutes, with certain optional and regulatory powers delegated to lower authorities such as school districts.

This does not imply that the federal government has adopted a "hands-off" position with respect to the education of the nation's children, but only that no federal legislation exists which requires school attendance. In many supportive and indirect ways the government is indeed involved in the problem. The framers of the Constitution recognized the desirability of diffusing education "throughout the community" and that education is a matter of public concern to be controlled and regulated by the state. Throughout the history of compulsory education legislation by the states, the Supreme Court has consistently supported the constitutionality of state laws in this field.† Such decisions have, for example, held that compulsory attendance laws do not invade the rights of parents to the control of their children and that the states have the right to pass on the qualifications of private and secular schools and on the adequacy of home instruction in lieu of public school instruction.

In the area of quality and equivalence of educational opportunity, the federal government has established its authority to regulate certain aspects of public education through the provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and its amendments.

The government is also becoming increasingly involved in the planning, support, and regulation of education through a variety of special programs (e.g., the Manpower Development and Training Act, the Vocational Education Act, The Economic Opportunity Act) and through the educational problems inherent in area redevelopment and assistance to federally

---

* The discussions in this chapter have drawn heavily on the single most comprehensive and reliable source of information concerning the status of school law in the United States: A. W. Steinhilber and C. J. Sokolowski, State Law on Compulsory Attendance, U.S. Office of Education, Washington, 1965.

† For a detailed listing of decisions and legal citations, see Steinhilber and Sokolowski, ibid., especially the section "Judicial Rulings."

impacted school districts. However, none of these federal activities have ever taken the form of the passage or enforcement of laws governing compulsory school attendance.

State Laws Governing School Attendance

The first compulsory school attendance law in the United States was enacted by the State of Massachusetts in the year 1852.* By 1918 all of the states† had enacted such laws (Alaska, not then a state, passed such a law in 1929). Not all of these laws were, in their early days, rigorously enforced, variously the result of public and official indifference, lack of adequate educational plants, or imprecision in wording of the early laws themselves.

The states have constantly upgraded their legislation, primarily in terms of increasing minimum ages for compulsory attendance and strengthening enforcement procedures and penalties for noncompliance.

In 1955 and thereafter, for the first time in history, some states repealed their compulsory attendance laws. It is believed that these actions were taken primarily in response to the 1954 U.S. Supreme Court decision declaring racial discrimination in public education unconstitutional.‡ At present, Mississippi and South Carolina do not have compulsory school attendance laws; Virginia has a basic attendance law, but leaves the application of the law to the option of the local school districts. The Louisiana legislature repealed the attendance law for that state in 1962, but in 1964 the law was reenacted in its original form.

Thus, the situation in 1965 is as follows: 49 states have compulsory school attendance laws currently in force; two states have no such laws in force; and in a single state, the compulsory attendance law is a matter of local option. Table 2 lists the compulsory school attendance age limits for the 50 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. The ages indicated are that at which attendance becomes compulsory and that at which attendance is no longer compulsory. If, for example, the upper age limit is listed as "16," a child may legally stop attending school at any time on or after his sixteenth birthday.

For the present study the range and distribution of the upper age limits for the 49 states that have laws in force are important: thirty-nine states set age 16 as the upper limit for compulsory schooling; seven set age 17 as the limit; and four set 18 as the limit. Thus, the overall

---

* Actually the first law was passed by Massachusetts Colony in 1642.

† In this report, the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico are included within the meaning of the generic term "states."

‡ Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, Shawnee County, Kansas, 347 U.S. 483, and Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka, Shawnee County, Kansas, 349 U.S. 294.

Table 2

AGE LIMITS FOR COMPULSORY SCHOOL ATTENDANCE, BY STATE
1959 and 1965

State	Age Limits* 1959	Age Limits* 1965	State	Age Limits* 1959	Age Limits* 1965
Alabama	7-16	7-16	Missouri	7-16	7-16
Alaska	7-16	7-16	Montana	7-16	7-16
Arizona	8-16	8-16	Nebraska	7-16	7-16
Arkansas	7-16	7-16	Nevada	7-17	7-17
California	8-16	8-16	New Hampshire	6-16	6-16
Colorado	8-16	7-16	New Jersey	7-16	7-16
Connecticut	7-16	7-16	New Mexico	6-17	6-17
Delaware	7-16	7-16	New York	7-16	7-16
District of Columbia	7-16	7-16	North Carolina	7-16	7-16
Florida	7-16	7-16	North Dakota	7-16	7-16
Georgia	7-16	7-16	Ohio	6-18	6-18
Hawaii	6-16	6-16	Oklahoma	7-18	7-18
Idaho	7-16	7-16	Oregon	7-18	7-18
Illinois	7-16	7-16	Pennsylvania	8-17	8-17
Indiana	7-16	7-16	Puerto Rico	8-14	8-16
Iowa	7-16	7-16	Rhode Island	7-16	7-16
Kansas	7-16	7-16	South Carolina	None	None
Kentucky	7-16	7-16	South Dakota	7-16	7-16
Louisiana	7-16	7-16	Tennessee	7-17	7-17
Maine	7-16	7-17	Texas	7-16	7-17
Maryland	7-16	7-16	Utah	6-18	6-18
Massachusetts	7-16	7-16	Vermont	7-16	7-16
Michigan	6-16	6-16	Virginia†	7-16	7-16
Minnesota	7-16	7-16	Washington	8-16	8-16
Mississippi	None	None	West Virginia	7-16	7-16
			Wisconsin	7-16	7-16
			Wyoming	7-16	7-17

* Age at which attendance becomes compulsory to age at which attendance is no longer compulsory.

† Optional with local school districts.

Source: U.S. Office of Education.

range of upper age limits is only three years, and age 16 is the upper limit for 84 percent of the states. This lack of variation between states precludes any serious attempt to establish statistical correlations between compulsory attendance ages and other variables, such as delinquency rates, using the state as the unit of analysis. In examining the data for 1959, one finds the same lack of variance in the age laws; between 1959 and 1965 only four states have made changes--Wyoming increased its age limit from 16 to 17; Puerto Rico, from 14 to 16; and late in 1965 both Maine and Texas also increased their age limits from 16 to 17.

Since these various compulsory attendance laws are state laws, they are binding on all persons and political subdivisions of each of the states. Thus, the law applies equally to all school districts and to all children within the state (with the exception of Virginia, which has local option); thus, there can be no variation within any state or among its schools. Ordinarily, the authority and responsibility for the implementation and enforcement of the law is delegated by the state to the chief officers of the local school districts. The districts in turn delegate this responsibility and authority to offices and persons within the district or to the individual schools.

The present study has indicated that many persons, including many officials, assume (1) that compulsory attendance laws operate as intended by statute and (2) that in most jurisdictions someone or some agency sees that all children within the legal age limits attend school. This, however, is not always the case. Although the Office of Education has reported that 93.5 percent of the children in the nation between the ages of 14 and 17 are enrolled in school,* the many reports concerning the school dropout problem offer a possibly contradictory conclusion. In these reports there is a general conclusion that approximately 30-35 percent of the nation's children do not complete high school.†

To reconcile these conclusions it is necessary to assume that a vast majority of dropouts are older than 17, who simply failed to complete high school. This reconciliation would then support two hypotheses (1) that dropouts occur primarily among the population of children that are above the minimum legal age for leaving school and (2) that nearly all children younger than that age are in fact enrolled in school. However, findings from the field work in the present study contradict both of these hypotheses.

---

* Steinhilber and Sokolowski, op. cit., Table 3.

† See for example Beatrice Crump Lee, School Dropouts, National Education Association, Washington, D.C., 1963; Daniel Schreiber (ed.), The School Dropout, National Education Association, Washington, D.C., 1964; U.S. Office of Education, Selected Reports and Statistics on School Dropouts, Circular No. OE-20063, USGPO, Washington, D.C., 1964.

This chapter considers certain provisions of the attendance laws themselves that modify the effective meaning of the basic compulsory age ranges or that influence the manner and effectiveness of enforcement of the laws. To quote from an Office of Education report concerning the interpretation of the fundamental age, attendance, and penalty clauses of the state laws, "These, however, cannot be used alone, for they do not present the whole picture in any state. Other laws qualifying or elaborating these provisions must be taken into consideration."*

This chapter also draws on the following findings from the field studies:

1. Many school systems have no systematic means for identifying, or even counting, the children resident in their jurisdictions who are within the compulsory age ranges.

2. Many school systems have little reliable information concerning the proportion of school age children in the district who are attending school.

3. Many school districts know little about the absolute number of children who voluntarily drop out of their schools.

4. In many jurisdictions a variety of factors result in ineffectual procedures for the enforcement of compulsory attendance laws.

5. Statutory compulsory attendance ages are largely meaningless as determinants of the behavior of children; a number of other factors must be taken into consideration as behavior determinants before the true meaning of the attendance laws can be apprehended.

No attempt is made here to provide a detailed state-by-state exposition of the compulsory attendance laws.† Rather, the major and common provisions will be summarized, and an attempt will be made to show the effects of specific factors on youth.

Exemption from Compulsory Attendance Laws

Although they vary greatly in number and stringency, all state laws governing compulsory school attendance contain express clauses for exemption from the minimum age and attendance provisions. These regulations

---

* Steinhilber and Sokolowski, op. cit.

† For such a detailed compilation, see Steinhilber and Sokolowski, op. cit.

are important to this study since they provide the legal means by which children of mandatory school-going ages manage to leave school.

All states waive attendance for children who are unable to attend regular classes because of illness or physical handicap, and some states also include emotional problems under the medical handicap clause. (Many states require attendance at special schools for children with certain physical problems.)

Most states also recognize uneducability as a cause for exemption from compulsory attendance. In some cases, there is a requirement that the condition be certified by a physician, psychologist, or other professional person. At the other extreme, some state laws are worded so vaguely that administrators use the clause to "get rid of kids who are too much of a problem"--it is often easier for a school to decide that a child whose behavior problems cannot be handled by the school is "uneducable" than to expel him. However, another common waiver provision is more often invoked in the case of the "problem student." A large number of state laws permit exemption of a child if, in the opinion of school authorities, he is "no longer able to profit from school" (sometimes "education," "educational experience," or "attendance in regular classes").

Several states exempt a child from compulsory attendance if he has met a combination of age and educational requirements. A common exemption of this type is found in states which have a basic minimum age requirement of 16; in these states a child may be exempted if he is 14 years old and has completed the eighth grade.

In some states, exemption from school attendance is related to employment and, thus, to child labor laws. Frequently, this permits a waiver of required school attendance if the child is 14 (sometimes 12) and has the promise of legal employment (sometimes there is a requirement of completion of a specified school grade, ranging from fourth to ninth). In states with this stipulation, the child labor law is usually written to permit the employment of a child of that age "if no longer legally required to attend school."

It is not unusual for the law to exempt a child of any age if his employment is required to meet his, or his family's, severe economic need. In other cases, all that is required is a parental request that a child below legal age be exempted from schooling. Several states specify that a child who is assigned to a school "in which the races are commingled" may be exempted from compulsory attendance at the request of his parents.

Two other quasi-exemption procedures that exist in most school systems are of interest. One of these is "expulsion," or "exclusion," which permits the local school system to reject a child for misbehavior or other causes. This procedure is little used in most systems, and children not desired by the school are usually permitted to withdraw under some other provision of the law. The other procedure is "suspension," the temporary exclusion of a child for some cause. One of the irrational and paradoxical

findings of the field studies is the prevalence of the use of suspensions as a "punishment" for truancy. In illustration, we quote from a conversation with an attendance official in one field location. The interview ran in part:

Q: "What do you do if a kid just stays away from school?"

A: "Well, if he refuses to come back, we suspend him for ten days."

Q: "What if he doesn't come back then?"

A: "Sometimes we suspend him for the rest of the term."

Q: "What happens then?"

A: "Usually they never come back."

There is considerable variability between school systems in the manner in which exemption and waiver procedures are applied or permitted to be used. In Michigan it appears that almost no nonmedical waivers are granted and that nearly all children are retained in school until the legal age of 16. In another location, which appears to have a serious dropout problem, a probation officer reported:

"Here, any kid who wants out of school can get out, no matter how old he is. All he has to do is act up enough and he's out; if everything else fails all the kid has to do is walk up and punch a teacher in the nose. If they're too big a problem for the school to handle, they turn them out on the street and we get 'em here."

Enforcement of Compulsory Attendance Laws

The school laws of all but two states contain specific statutes concerning the appointment and responsibilities of personnel charged with the enforcement of compulsory attendance laws. These persons, often referred to as "attendance officers" have the general tasks of identifying children who are not attending school, investigating the case, and initiating remedial action. Such officers are usually vested with some police powers and may arrest or take into custody children, or even parents, who are in violation of the laws. In most states violation of the attendance laws is a misdemeanor (particularly by the parent) and various penalties are specified.

Of itself, a reading of state laws does not permit an assessment of the degree or quality of enforcement by attendance officers either within a state or within a specific school district. Consideration must be also given to a variety of other factors: the qualifications of the actual personnel involved, funds available, relationships of schools, local welfare and police agencies, local district opinion and policy, etc. For

example, in South Carolina, it would appear that attendance officers would necessarily be quite ineffective; there is no compulsory attendance law to provide penalty, and the law appointing attendance personnel directs them to attempt to "influence" and "persuade" pupils to attend school. However, with the support of local courts, an effective alternative to usual legal procedures has been developed--Visiting Teachers (attendance personnel) bring charges of "parental neglect" or "contributing to the delinquency of a minor" against parents who do not properly see to the education of their children.

The field work findings suggest that in most systems attendance personnel are of high calibre and do an effective job within the legal and policy framework in which they must work. Where a school census is regularly conducted, such personnel are able to track down nonenrolled as well as truant youth. However, in most places their work is limited to handling cases of truancy by enrolled children; contacts with nonenrolled children are limited to cases reported to them by other persons or agencies. (E.g., reports by other children, juvenile police and probation departments, and welfare agencies.)

Police and other agencies seldom become involved in truancy problems except to report children to school personnel or when formal charges are brought against habitual truants by a school. An unusual example of work by an outside agency was found in one locality where a county welfare department has made parent cooperation in seeing to a child's regular school attendance a condition of eligibility for welfare payment for the minor child.

Nonlegal Factors Affecting School Attendance

On the basis of the literature on the characteristics of school dropouts, the field study information, and the general finding that the phenomenon of dropout has increased during a period in which attendance laws have been continually strengthened, a general conclusion of this study is that other influences may have more effect on the decisions of youth to leave school before graduation or attainment of legal ages than have the attendance laws themselves. In support of this conclusion is the finding from New Orleans that there was no drop in school enrollments in the two-year period during which the state compulsory attendance law was repealed. Similarly, in Charleston, South Carolina, the repeal of the attendance law appears to have had no noticeable effect on enrollments or attendance.

Some specific nonlegal factors that were found to be influential in determining attendance behavior, such as the curricula and special program offerings of schools, counseling programs, parental attitudes, and local employment opportunities for youth, are discussed in detail in later chapters of this report.

Statistics on School Attendance and the Child Population

In the attempt to determine empirically the degree to which compulsory attendance laws were enforced (i.e., how many of the children within the compulsory age ranges actually were in school) it was necessary to know (1) how many such children there were in a school district and (2) how many such children were actually in school. The problems encountered in the attempts to gather such information are detailed below.

Youth Population Data

For the purposes of this study, it was necessary to gather information on the size of the youth population and to organize these data according to a number of detailed breakdowns such as age, sex, and race. Although such data are available for decennial census years, this study was conducted when the census information was already five years old. However, the education laws of most states require that a "school census" be conducted either on a continuing or periodic basis (usually by the individual school districts) and it was hoped that these censuses would provide reliable youth population information for the field study sites. Unfortunately, this was not always found to be the case. In fact, in a number of the field sites no reliable estimates of the youth population appear to be obtainable.

These comments are not intended as criticisms of the school administrations involved. School systems tend by their nature to be operating organizations, generally understaffed and underfunded. A harried administration, faced with many critical operating problems, might understandably place a rather low priority on the trying and costly task of conducting an annual school census. This situation is reflected in the following typical responses received by the field research teams when they inquired for such data:

"We use the 1960 census data."

"We used to do a census every year, but then we found out that nobody ever used the stuff, so we quit a few years back."

"The kids in our classes always tell us when a new kid moves into the area and isn't going to school."

"We try to make projections, but I don't think they would do for your purposes."

"We wish we could do a school census . . . yes, there is a law . . . but there's never any money in the budget for it. It would be very helpful for our attendance people."

Some of the localities studied did conduct regular school censuses of high quality; Flint, Michigan, is an exemplary case. Michigan law

requires an annual school census; the State Department of Education establishes procedures for data collection and reporting, and the responsibility for the conduct of the census is finally delegated to principals in individual attendance areas. The census involves an actual door-to-door enumeration that state officials supervise and inspect carefully--particularly since state aid is apportioned on the basis of child population. Thus, in Flint it was possible for the research team to establish quickly and accurately the youth population base, by a variety of breakdowns, and this in turn permitted the calculation of highly reliable rates for such factors as enrollment.

Another problem encountered in the collection of educational statistics in the field studies concerned the attempt to answer the question, "How many children are in school?" In most of the field sites, several kinds of such information were available. The major classes of statistics that are commonly collected by school districts are:

1. Enrollment. This usually refers to the number of children who are formally enrolled at the beginning of the school term and who maintain attendance for a specified number of days following the opening of school. The common statistics are "ten-day enrollments" and "thirty-day enrollments."

2. Attendance. This term ordinarily refers to the number of students actually present in classrooms at a specified time. The attendance statistic encountered most often is "Average Daily Attendance" (ADA), which reports the average number of pupils present in class over a school term or year. These data are often used by states as the basis for allocating financial aid to school districts and for other planning functions.

3. Membership. This ambiguous term appeared in many of the data collected in the study, usually as "year-end membership" of a class, school, or district. In many cases it was impossible to discover from local authorities just what such "membership" data measure, e.g., whether year-end membership was a count of pupils enrolled or pupils in attendance at the close of school.

Such usages present serious practical problems in the attempt to derive comparative statistics for school districts that will accurately reflect the numbers of children who are "in school" and, thus, measure empirically the degree of enforcement of attendance laws. These problems are further complicated in many localities by the dearth of reliable data on dropouts.

An example, which is not atypical, illustrates the situation. In one large city school system there was no standard policy for determining when to drop a child from the official enrollment records. If the child had been excused by official action, if he had officially transferred, or "if we know that he's a dropout," his name was removed from the records; if, however, a child "mysteriously" stopped coming to

school and truancy procedures failed to resolve the situation officially (a not unusual happening in the system), the child was carried as enrolled but absent for the remainder of the school term, sometimes several months.

In all of the field studies, attempts were made to collect data on the number of children who "dropped out," that is, voluntarily withdrew from school attendance before high school graduation. This would, of course, provide a positive check on the enforcement of the attendance laws for those children below legal ages. This was possible in some locations; however, in several places such dropout data either were not collected at all or were hopelessly confused. For example, in one study site the only data collected and summarized were for all "withdrawals," an aggregate statistic included medical excuses, mental retardates, institutionalized cases, transfers to other school systems, and dropouts.

In some cases, the study has had to rely on the personal estimates by officials of the loss of students from the school population; in others, estimates derived by simple subtraction of year-end enrollments from beginning enrollments were the only data obtainable. In only a few cases do the collected data appear to represent reliably the true losses of students from the local school systems studied. Furthermore, these experiences in working with "grass-roots" data sources have led us to reconsider the utility of the many published estimates of the scope of the dropout problem for the nation.

Chapter 4

THE REGULATION OF CHILD LABOR IN THE UNITED STATES

The Laws Governing the Employment of Children

The laws and regulations governing work by, and the employment of, children in this country are in one sense simpler and in another sense more complex than the school attendance laws previously discussed. The child labor laws are simpler in that there is a basic federal law covering such employment within the United States; but they are more complex in that each of the several states has a separate set of laws and regulations in addition to the federal law.

The basic federal child labor standards are contained in the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA), passed by the Congress in 1938, and its amendments. The passage of this act was the culmination of a series of actions by the Congress, that began in 1906, to have recognized the right of the federal government to regulate the employment of children.* At present, the child labor provisions of the FLSA are prepotent in all jurisdictions of the United States. The act recognizes the rights of the individual states to enact legislation concerning child labor standards, but it specifically provides that, wherever federal and state laws conflict on a standard, the more stringent standard shall prevail. Thus, for example, if the federal regulations specify a certain minimum age for employment in a certain industry or occupation, and the labor laws of a state specify a higher (more stringent) minimun age, then the law of that state prevails for all persons within that state; had the federal law contained the higher minimum age, it would have then prevailed.

In addition to the general terms of the state and federal laws regulating the employment of youth, three other types of legislation must also be considered in treating the problem of child labor: the Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act, the alcoholic beverage control acts (ABC laws) of the various states, and local ordinances that regulate youth employment.

---

* The reader interested in a more fully developed history of child labor legislation in the United States is referred to Beatrice McConnell, et al., Growth of Labor Law in the United States, Bureau of Labor Standards, U.S. Dept. of Labor, Washington, D.C., 1962.

Regulation of Youth Employment Under the Fair Labor Standards Act

The Fair Labor Standards Act provides the basic legal model for most youth employment regulation in the nation. The act contains four basic elements: (1) employments covered by the act, (2) minimum ages applicable, (3) exemptions and exceptions, and (4) hazardous occupation provisions.

Coverage of the Act

Broadly speaking, the act applies to individuals engaged in commerce or the production of goods for commerce or in occupations closely related or directly essential to the production of goods for commerce and to enterprises engaged in commerce or production of goods for commerce. In addition, producers, manufacturers, or dealers are prohibited from shipping or delivering for shipment in interstate or foreign commerce any goods produced in an establishment in or about which oppressive child labor has been employed within 30 days prior to the removal of the goods.

It was clear in the field study work that the child labor standards of the federal law are not well understood by some local employment office personnel and that the provisions of the law are often grossly misunderstood or even unknown to many employers. This lack of understanding on the part of employers has serious implication regarding youth employment opportunities, as is illustrated in the following statements by two employment department officials who were interviewed:

> "Employers understand that there are labor laws, but they're not familiar with the ins-and-outs. They can sometimes employ kids legally, but they don't know it."

> "Some employers are afraid they might break rules--so they just won't hire anybody under 18."

Basic Minimum Age Standards

In general the FLSA sets age 16 as the minimum for any covered employment except in those occupations covered by Hazardous Occupation Orders. Minors 14 and 15 may be employed outside school hours in a variety of nonmanufacturing and nonmining occupations, however, hours of work are limited on both a daily and weekly basis, and no work may be performed before 7 a.m. or after 7 p.m. Minors 16 and over may be employed during school hours, for any number of hours, and during any period of time.

Originally, the minimum age provisions of the act did not apply to children employed in agriculture unless they were required to attend school by state law. However, an amendment passed in 1949 extended the coverage of the minimum age stipulations to make it illegal to employ minors younger than age 16 in agricultural work during the hours in which school is in session in the district in which the minor resides while so

employed. No federal minimum age standard covers the employment of minors in agriculture outside school hours or during vacations or holidays, except that the Sugar Act contains certain provisions with which producers engaged in the production and harvesting of sugar beets or sugarcane must comply in order to obtain maximum benefit payments. These provisions include a minimun age of 14 years for employment and a maximum 8-hour day for children between 14 and 16 years of age.

Exemptions and Exceptions

There are relatively few specific exemptions to the child labor coverage of the FLSA; these are as follows:

1. A minor child may work at any age and in any occupation in a business solely owned by his parents, except in manufacturing, mining, and hazardous occupations. This exemption appears to apply mainly to service, trade, and agricultural work.

2. Minors employed as actors and performers in theaters, motion pictures, radio, and television are exempted.

3. Children engaged in the delivery of newspapers to the consumer are exempted.

4. Minors employed in agriculture are exempted for work performed outside the school hours of the local school district.

5. A specific exemption exists for homeworkers engaged in making wreaths of natural evergreens, including the harvesting of the evergreens.

At only two points do these exemption provisions seem to relate significantly to school attendance regulations. First, item 1 (the family business exemption) is often involved in obtaining exemption of children from the compulsory school attendance laws since many states accept legal employment in support of the family's financial need as a reason for exemption from school attendance. Second, many school systems in agricultural areas where there is a shortage of adult labor declare special crop recesses or vacations during critical planting or harvesting seasons. Thus, these periods "are legally outside regular school hours," and the employment of children becomes legal under the terms of the FLSA.

Hazardous Employment Provisions

Special FLSA standards are set for the employment of minors in occupations declared by the Secretary of Labor to be hazardous or detrimental to the health or well-being of such minors. Seventeen Hazardous Occupations Orders have been issued, which establish an 18-year minimum age for employment in those occupations found and declared hazardous.

The 17 Hazardous Occupations Orders are listed below:

1. Occupations in or about plants or establishments manufacturing or storing explosives or articles containing explosive components.

2. Occupations of motor-vehicle driver and helper.

3. Coal-mine occupations.

4. Logging occupations and occupations in the operation of any sawmill, lath mill, shingle mill, or cooperage-stock mill.

*5. Occupations involved in the operation of power-driven woodworking machines.

6. Occupations involving exposure to radioactive substances and to ionizing radiations.

7. Occupations involved in the operation of elevators and other power-driven hoisting apparatus.

*8. Occupations involved in the operation of power-driven metal forming, punching, and shearing machines.

9. Occupations in connection with mining, other than coal.

*10. Occupations involved in meat-processing operations.

11. Occupations involved in the operation of certain power-driven bakery machines.

*12. Occupations involved in the operation of certain power-driven paper-product machines.

13. Occupations involved in the manufacture of brick, tile, and kindred products.

*14. Occupations involved in the operation of circular saws, band saws, and guillotine shears.

15. Occupations involved in wrecking, demolition, and shipbreaking operations.

*16. Occupations involved in roofing operations.

*17. Occupations involved in excavation operations.

---

* Exemptions provided for apprentices and student-learners under specified conditions.

These hazardous employment regulations are of particular interest in the present study for several reasons. First, they set an age limit that extends beyond the age range for all states' compulsory school laws and for all states' definitions of a juvenile. Second, the findings from the field studies indicate that both the federal and state laws governing hazardous employment are much more readily enforced than are the general child labor laws. Finally, it appears that in some places the hazardous occupation provisions place a much more serious restriction on the employment opportunities for youth in the 14-17 year age range than do the more general child labor regulations; many of the types of jobs that are suitable for a non-high school trained youth who has no particular occupational skills are covered by the hazardous occupation laws.

The only exception permitted to the hazardous occupation regulations is that 16- and 17-year-olds may engage in certain covered occupations if enrolled in bona fide apprenticeship programs or in recognized cooperative vocational training programs.

The Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act

The Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act, passed in 1936, contains a provision that prohibits the employment of any boy younger than 16 (or girl younger than 18) in work performed under a U.S. Government contract in excess of $10,000. This act is probably not a significant impediment to work opportunities for youth, except possibly in specific localities where such government work forms the major economic base of a community. In none of the field studies was this act mentioned as a problem in the youth employment area, and the U.S. Department of Labor reported only six cases of violation of the age provision of the act during the four years 1960-63.*

State Child Labor Laws and Regulations

At present all states have some form of child labor law that regulates the conditions under which the employment of minor children is permitted. While the laws are not consistent among states, there appears a tendency for the state laws to approach the standards set by the federal law. In 1962, the Department of Labor summarized these tendencies in state laws as follows:

---

* See the Annual Report of the Secretary of Labor, Appendix II for these years, or the reprinted statistics on federal child labor law violations published annually by the Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Division of the Department of Labor under the title Child Labor.

Present laws show a tendency toward the following standards:

- A 16-year minimum for factory work.
- A 16-year minimum for all work during school hours.
- An 18-year minimum for hazardous work.
- Authorization of a state agency to declare occupations hazardous and prohibited to minors under 18.
- A 40-hour week, at least for children under 16.
- Limitation on working time outside school hours for in-school youth.
- Prohibition of night work, more extensive for younger than for older children.
- Employment certificates for minors under 18.*

Today the following "tendencies" might be added to the above listing:

- A 21-year age limit for work in places where alcoholic beverages are sold (under ABC laws).
- A 14-year minimum for work in agriculture during school hours.
- No minimum age for work in agriculture outside school hours.

This listing of tendencies does not represent the present state of affairs in state child labor legislation, but only the direction in which recent history would seem to indicate that such legislation is moving. Summary information on the present status of state laws is presented below.†

---

* U.S. Dept. of Labor, Bureau of Labor Standards, Growth of Labor Law in the United States, USGPO, Washington, D.C., 1962, p. 20.

† The reader interested in detailed exposition of the laws of the various states relating to child labor is referred to the following publication of the Bureau of Labor Standards of the U.S. Dept. of Labor: State Child Labor Standards (Bull. 158, revised September 1965). The Bureau of Labor Standards and the Wage and Hour and Public Contract Divisions also publish numerous informational memoranda and bulletins covering and updating state labor standards for employment of youth.

State Minimum Age Laws

Table 3 summarizes the minimum age standards of the child labor regulations of the 52 states. The ages cited represent only the basic provisions, and no attempt is made here to include exceptions or special provisions. The table covers the regulations applicable to the three major occupational categories commonly covered in state laws, and a breakdown is provided for work (1) during regular school hours and (2) outside regular school hours. In general, the provisions summarized in Table 3 apply to all youth, regardless of educational status; however, some states make special exceptions to the minimum age laws for children who are not legally required to attend shcool or who have met specific educational requirements (e.g., completion of the eighth grade).

Most state laws also limit the permissible hours of work for minors within specific age ranges (usually under 16). Usually such employment is limited to 40 (occasionally 48) hours per week and the stipulation is often made that time spent in school shall be counted as a part of the total hours worked. There are also a variety of provisions governing night work that specify those hours of the night during which covered minors may not be employed.

The labor legislation in all but two states contains specific consideration of hazardous occupations by youth. The occupational coverage of these regulations sometimes follows that of the 17 Hazardous Occupations Orders of the federal government, but there is still great variation among states; these variations may take the form of increasing or decreasing the number of covered occupations or lowering the minimum age requirement for certain occupations to 16.

The Alcoholic Beverage Control Laws (ABC laws) of the states also place minimum age constraints on youth employment. Almost all states have such laws, which usually stipulate age 21 as the minimum for any employment that involves the selling or serving of beers, wines, or liquors. About forty states also have laws that set minimum ages from 18 to 21 for employment in or about places which sell or serve alcohol. It is interesting to note that in some states such employment has been declared to be hazardous in that it might tend to impair the morals of a minor.

In many states the ABC laws have been written or interpreted to exempt from their provisions employment in establishments where the sale of beverages is not the primary business, e.g., supermarkets that sell beer, restaurants with an associated bar, and hotels with a liquor store on the premises. Such exemptions open a wide range of unskilled or semiskilled clerical and service jobs to youth younger than 18.

Table 3

NUMBER OF STATES SPECIFYING VARIOUS MINIMUM AGES FOR EMPLOYMENT IN MAJOR OCCUPATIONAL GROUPS

Basic Minimum Age	Occupational Group					
	Manufacturing		Nonmanufacturing		Agriculture	
	During School Hours	Outside School Hours	During School Hours	Outside School Hours	During School Hours	Outside School Hours
17 or above	0	0	0	0	0	0
16	27	20	24	1	12	0
15	2	1	2	0	3	0
14	23	27	24	40	18	9
13	0	0	0	0	0	0
12	0	2*	0	2*	1	4*
11	0	0	0	0	0	0
10	0	0	0	0	0	1
No minimum age provision	0	2	2	9	18	38

* Includes one state (California) where the minimum age is 12 during school vacations and on weekly school holidays, and 14 at other times outside school hours.

Source: U.S. Dept. of Labor.

Relationship to School Attendance Laws

In many states there is either a statutory or implied relationship between the age laws governing the employment of minors and state compulsory education laws. In some states the eligibility of a child of a given age for employment is a function of whether or not the child is legally required to attend school; and a lower age limit, or no age limit, may be set for those who have graduated or been excused from school. Many states exempt from the compulsory school attendance laws children who have either reached certain ages or completed certain grades and have the promise of employment; similar exemptions from both the school and labor laws may be granted to children of any age to work for their parents or who work because of family economic necessity.

The interaction between these sets of laws is usually controlled through the requirement for employment certificates or "work permits" by children below some specified age; most states require such permits, and the normal age limit is 18 years.

Work permits are usually administered by state departments of labor or education with actual issuance handled by school officials at the level of the local school district. It should be noted that, although there is no federal requirement for such permits, under a cooperative program between the Department of Labor and the states, work permits and age certificates issued under state child labor laws and under the supervision of a state agency are accepted as proof of age under the Fair Labor Standards Act in 45 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico. Federal certificates of age are issued in Idaho, Mississippi, South Carolina, and Texas; and special arrangements for proof of age are in effect in Alaska.

The usual procedure for issuance of such a permit is as follows:

1. The minor obtains a statement from the prospective employer describing the work the youth is to perform, the industry, and the hours of work. A physician's statement showing that the minor is physically fit to do the intended work may also be required.

2. The minor submits these statements, together with documentary proof of age such as a birth certificate, to the local school official or other issuing officer, who determines the legality of the employment for the particular minor and issues the permit.

3. The issuing officer sends the permit, ordinarily issued for a specific position and employer, to the employer, who keeps it on file for the duration of the minor's employment.

4. The issuing officer also sends a copy of the permit to the state supervising agency, usually the labor department, which reviews the legality of the employment, taking into account the minimum age for the position, the minor's age, and other relevent factors.

Most states with permit systems also require employers to maintain and submit certain records of hours, etc., for all minors in their employ.

The work permit system is intended to serve the interests of both the employer and the youth. The certification permits the employer to avoid unintentional employment of a minor illegally and also ensures that an employer will not take advantage of a child.

Enforcement of Child Labor Laws

Responsibility for inspection and enforcement of federal and local child labor laws devolves on many agencies and persons. In the present study it was concluded that the nature of the problem of discovering illegal employment of minors makes rigorous enforcement impossible at the present time and under present laws.

Investigators from the Department of Labor have many responsibilities in the enforcement process under the FLSA. They make an investigation to determine compliance with the child labor provisions of the act, minimum wage and overtime provisions, and equal pay provisions in every establishment that is checked. State labor department personnel are responsible only for the enforcement of state labor laws. However, considering the number of commercial businesses, farms, and ranches in the United States, regular and all-inclusive inspection would be an enormous job. Information gathered during the field work indicates that most violations of child labor laws come to light through one of four sources: (1) complaints filed by various individuals (e.g., competing employers, interested citizens); (2) violations noted during the course of an inspector's regular visits to establishments for other purposes; (3) close surveillance of farms and ranches during crop seasons; and (4) spot inspection of employers with histories of child labor violations.

It is often felt that employment certificate systems provide a means for careful enforcement of child labor laws; to quote the Department of Labor:

> Employment certificates also serve as a link between school and work. They help enforcing authorities to know where young persons are working. School officials, who usually issue the certificates, and labor law enforcement officials thus keep in touch with the child during the transitional period of his working life.*

---

* U.S. Dept. of Labor, Bureau of Labor Standards, State Child Labor Standards, Bulletin 158, Washington, D.C., 1965 (Revised).

The system of employment certificates does appear to help in the enforcement process. However, there is ample evidence that a significant amount of illegal employment does take place, involving youth who could not have been so employed had there been compliance with employment certification requirements.

The following data, reported by the Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Division of the Department of Labor, are indicative of the scope of illegal employment of minors in the nation. These data represent only discovered violations of the FLSA and do not include violations of state laws.

	Number of Minors Illegally Employed		
	Younger than Age 16 in		
Year	Agriculture	Other	Ages 16 or 17 in Hazardous Work
1960	4,470	2,457	2,972
1961	5,727	2,958	4,047
1962	4,236	2,840	3,364
1963	6,926	5,584	4,764
1964	7,972	7,388	5,623

Total minors illegally employed over five years = 71,328

It was impossible in the present study to collect reliable data on either the number of children in the under-18 age group who are in the labor force or the number of violations of state child labor laws. Therefore, it is difficult to assess the overall scope of illegal employment of minors. Nevertheless, the data above indicate that some 71,000 children (mostly under the age of 16) were illegally employed during the 1960-64 period and thus make it reasonable to conclude that the problem of illegal employment is of major proportions.

Information collected during the field studies from persons in the labor and employment field and from school officials responsible for the administration of work permits, indicated that, although accurate data on numbers of work permits issued are available, these data do not represent a census of all employed youth. In one major city, work permit officials estimated that two-thirds of the children in the city who were working did not have permits; this would mean that there were some 6,000 violations of the state law in that one city alone.

Many of these officials felt that illegal employment of youth often was unintentional. They further felt that since close enforcement and inspection are not feasible the solution must be through educational and information programs aimed at employers and children alike.

Chapter 5

GENERAL ASPECTS OF THE DELINQUENCY PROBLEM

The Nature and Extent of Youth Crime and Offenses

There is no question in the minds of most Americans that juvenile delinquency and youth crime present a problem of major proportion in our nation. In veiw of this, it seems strange that although everyone is certain that there is an unpardonable amount of such delinquency, no one knows just how much; most authorities are reluctant even to estimate the total number of crimes perpetrated by youth in any given year. This is not a conclusion unique to this study; many have reached it before.* The staff of the Children's Bureau have likened the incidence of youth crime to an iceberg, where the known and observed incidence is small in comparison with the bulk of unknown offenses that lies below the surface.†

Statistics on the Incidence of Youth Offenses

Two major sources regularly and systematically report on the incidence of offenses by youth: the Uniform Crime Reports (UCR) and Juvenile Court Statistics (JCS). The UCR is an annual report of the Federal Bureau of Investigation that provides statistical summaries of criminal and police activities for the nation. It details, for example, the Index of Crime (which summarizes major crimes for the preceding year) and provides detailed data on all persons arrested by reporting police departments. The JCS, published annually by the Children's Bureau, provides statistics on all cases referred to some 500 juvenile courts in the nation.

However, through no fault of the agencies involved,‡ each of these sources represents an underreporting of the true incidence of delinquency.

---

* See for example "Problems of Criminal and Delinquency Statistics," in M. E. Wolfgang, L. Savitz, and N. Johnson, The Sociology of Crime and Delinquency, John Wiley & Sons, New York, 1962. Also Bernice M. Moore, Juvenile Delinquency: Research, Theory, and Comment, National Education Association, Washington, D.C., 1958.

† "Juvenile Delinquency" in Health, Education, and Welfare Indicators, June 1963.

‡ See, for example, the caveat printed in the introduction to any edition of Juvenile Court Statistics.

Neither agency has legal authority to require reporting by local police or courts, nor can they demand that reports be submitted on standard forms or in accordance with any standardized instructions.* Only because of the efforts of the staffs of the two agencies and the cooperation of the contributing departments do these sources of information exist. And despite their shortcomings, these publications are excellent sources of information, particularly for the development of broad generalizations concerning the trends of juvenile crime.

These data, however, are not indications of the total incidence of juvenile crime in the nation; the major caveat to be inserted here is that these data consist only of offenses known to the police and cleared by arrest. To state that an offense has been committed by a juvenile, or for a case to come before a court it is necessary, of course, to identify an offender. Thus, these sources report only some unknown fraction of all criminal activity of the nation's youth.

In reviewing studies of the incidence of undetected or "hidden" crime, Perlman has concluded that perhaps a majority of the country's apparently law-abiding citizens have at some time committed criminal acts that have not come to official attention. He also concludes that "to measure delinquency by this definition, that is, the number of children committing delinquent acts whether or not they come to the attention of an official agency, is practically impossible.†

Even when a child comes to police attention, it is far from certain that he will ever become a statistic in the national reports. For example, in Oakland over the past five years, only about one-half of the formal juvenile police contacts have resulted in arrests that would be reported in the Uniform Crime Reports; the remaining cases were handled through informal counseling and probation procedures. In some study sites, only about a third of the police contacts appear to become arrest statistics, with the remainder handled by specialized counseling. Also, not all of these arrests will appear in the enumerations in Juvenile Court Statistics, since many courts have informal procedures that do not result in formal hearings. A finding from Flint, Michigan, provides an

---

* The Federal Bureau of Investigation distributes free, standarized forms for reporting under the UCR program and an excellent set of standards for reporting in the "Uniform Crime Reporting Handbook." However, in the introduction to the Handbook, Mr. Hoover, Director of the Bureau, states that the book is for the "specific purpose of giving guidance and assistance" to contributors.

† I. Richard Perlman, Statistical Aspects of Antisocial Behavior of the Minor in the United States, 1963. Prepared paper available through the Children's Bureau, U.S. Dept. of Health, Education, and Welfare.

illustration: it appears that only about half of the juveniles processed to the courts by the Flint police are included in the JCS tabulations of official or unofficial court cases.

The following quotation describes the situation as seen by officials working with youthful offenders:

> Outlying communities tend to handle problems themselves insofar as it is possible. Rural police officials know their children and make every effort to influence them to behave from day to day. This is more possible in small communities than in larger cities. Sometimes smaller communities wait too long before referring youngsters and this is an area needing an increased amount of attention. In contrast to this, larger, urban police departments tend to do less screening. As a consequence of this, over one-third of those referred to the Juvenile Department were dismissed following a brief casework service and of those dismissed, past experience indicates that 85% are never heard from again.*

This illustrates the effect that differential "handling" procedures at the level of the local police department can have on the apparent incidence of youth crime, if only official reports, such as those filed with the Uniform Crime Reports, are considered. The point concerning differential procedures for urban and rural situations might also lead one to question conclusions derived from national reports of the incidence of crime by youth in rural and urban areas.

Trends in Youth Crime

Only a general picture of youth crime in the nation is presented here to form a background for the chapters to follow; since we have noted that none of the national crime data represent all juvenile crime, or even all police contacts, most of the discussion will be cast in relative rather than absolute terms.

Table 4 presents data on the total number of persons arrested (and reported to the FBI) in the nation and on the age distributions of those arrested for three recent years. Noteworthy is the consistency of the age distribution over time; each age group holds its relative position over the three year period. The table also illustrates a phenomenon that is currently creating much public interest: in relation to the total crime picture, arrests of younger persons (particularly those 17 and younger) are increasing at a greater rate than are arrests in the older groups. These trends may indicate that more youths are committing

---

* 1964 Annual Report of the Lane County Juvenile Department, Eugene, Oregon, 1965.

Table 4

ARREST TRENDS, BY AGE
1961-1963

Age	Percent of Total Arrests 1961	1962	1963	Change, 1961-63
< 15	6.0%	6.4%	6.8%	+0.8%
15	2.4	3.1	3.2	+0.8
16	3.1	3.2	4.1	+1.0
17	3.2	3.1	3.4	+0.2
18	3.3	3.1	3.2	-0.1
19	3.0	3.1	3.1	+0.1
20	2.7	2.7	3.0	+0.3
21	2.9	2.8	2.9	0.0
22	2.5	2.6	2.6	+0.1
23	2.4	2.3	2.4	0.0
24	2.4	2.3	2.3	-0.1
25-29	10.4	10.1	9.7	-0.7
30-34	10.7	10.3	9.6	-1.1
35-39	11.1	10.9	10.4	-0.7
40-44	9.9	10.0	9.8	-0.1
45-49	8.3	8.2	7.9	-0.4
≥ 50	15.7	15.7	15.4	-0.3
Total arrests (millions)	4.35	4.61	4.51	+0.16

Source: Uniform Crime Reports, 1961, 1962, 1963.

crimes; on the other hand, it may simply be that the increasing alarm over the "delinquency problem" has stimulated law enforcement agencies to enforce more vigorously and arrest more readily within the younger age groups. Better enforcement is certainly significant in the increase in total number of arrests; from 1960 to 1963 the percentage of known crimes cleared by arrest has steadily climbed from about 19 percent to 25 percent. The main point of interest is that, as police response to crime becomes more and more efficient through, for example, training and professionalization, increased public support, and advanced technology (e.g., automatic data and information systems), numbers of arrests may appear to skyrocket. However, it is well to remember that most reported crimes still are not resolved by arrest and that the numbers of arrests reported by the police are increasing at a faster rate than are the numbers of crimes reported to the police.

Juvenile crime is largely a male problem. Of persons under 18 years of age, in national crime statistics, boys appear more than five times as often as girls, in terms of both persons arrested and juvenile court cases. This ratio has held constant over several years, with boys accounting for approximately 85 percent of all delinquency and court actions and for about 90 percent of serious (felony-type) crimes. This conclusion (based on UCR and JCS data) was supported by the information gathered in the field work; in some study sites, boys accounted for almost all serious juvenile crime.

There is a significant difference between boy and girl delinquents in terms of the specific crimes with which they are charged. The following tabulation from Juvenile Court Statistics of reasons for referral to juvenile courts for a typical year, 1963, shows this difference dramatically: the five most often cited reasons for referral for each sex are:

Boys	Girls
Petty larceny	Running away
Burglary	Ungovernable behavior
Auto theft	Petty larceny
Disorderly conduct	Sex offenses
Assaults	Curfew violation

These causes for court action accounted for 49.8 percent of the boys' cases and 67.7 percent of the girls'; in fact, 43.2 percent of the girls' cases were accounted for by "runaway" and "ungovernable behavior" alone. Thus, the picture of delinquent activity differs markedly by sex: crimes committed by boys tend to be more serious and to be acts that would be considered crimes if committed by adults; girls' offenses tend more to be crimes only if committed by a juvenile. Girls are more likely to commit "public wrongs" (crimes against the standards of society); and boys, to commit "personal wrongs" or torts (crimes against persons or property).

The Structure of Male Delinquency

Table 5 presents the causes for arrest of male youths younger than age 18 for 1963 for the United States. These data are presented here for two purposes: (1) to provide an overview of the kinds of crimes committed by the youth population and (2) to establish a foundation for the later presentations of findings from the field studies. The federal statistics do not permit reporting of these data by detail such as age, race, and location; however, the field study information will permit later discussion of some of these areas of interest.

While the data in Table 5 make it appear that American youth are quite versatile in finding ways to get into trouble with the law, there still appears a decided clustering of cases, which indicates that only a few types of crimes are particularly prevalent. Four crimes--larceny, burglary, disorderly conduct, and auto theft--account for slightly over half of all reported arrests, while almost a third of the remainder is accounted for by the "all other" category. Since three of the most prevalent crimes represent theft of property, it is interesting that robbery (theft from a person, by force) is not included. The fourth major offense "disorderly conduct" is difficult to interpret since the field work information indicated that this category is something of a "wastebasket" for many police departments who apply it to a wide variety of offenses not elsewhere covered; for example, to cover cases of children who have not committed specific offenses, but who the police feel should come to official attention (e.g., a child who is not cooperative when questioned on the street at night).

Another point of interest is that the data in Table 5 do not support certain popular conceptions of the delinquent activities of the nation's youth. Narcotics offenses are infrequent, accounting for only a very small fraction of youth crime. (However, this is a type of "private offense" that may easily go undetected by police.) The types of criminal activity ordinarily associated with the operation of organized crime--sex, narcotics, and gambling--do not appear to be as prevalent among juveniles as many persons fear. Crimes of violence against persons, such as homicide, rape, and aggravated assault, are negligible within the total juvenile crime picture (aggravated assault comprised only about one percent of all cases); these it seems, are crimes of adults, not youth. However, there is one kind of vicious youth crime that cannot be reliably detected in such statistics; this is gang-type activity. This activity appears to be increasing in some areas where it sometimes takes particularly violent and aggressive forms.

The federal data on crime also indicate that juvenile crime and delinquency is predominantly an urban problem. In 1963 only 6 percent of juvenile arrests were made in rural areas; 7 percent of juvenile court cases for that year were rural. Even when correction is made for the population differential between the urban and rural areas of the nation, the juvenile crime rate for the urban areas is some six times

Table 5

ARRESTS OF MALES LESS THAN 18 YEARS OLD
IN THE UNITED STATES
1963

Charge	Number of Arrests	Percent of Total
Murder	347	0.06%
Negligent homicide	155	0.03
Rape	1,326	0.25
Robbery	7,483	1.38
Assaults	23,590	4.36
Burglary	66,972	12.39
Larceny	113,013	20.91
Auto theft	42,530	7.87
Embezzlement and fraud	906	0.17
Stolen property	3,290	0.61
Forgery and counterfeiting	1,728	0.32
Sex offenses	7,459	1.38
Narcotic drug laws	1,202	0.22
Possession of weapons	6,783	1.25
Liquor law	20,252	3.75
Driving while intoxicated	1,176	0.22
Disorderly conduct	50,399	9.32
Drunkeness	13,865	2.57
Vagrancy	8,710	1.61
Gambling	1,589	0.29
All other (excludes traffic)	167,737	31.04
Total	540,512	100.00%

Source: Uniform Crime Reports, 1963.

as great as for the rural. There is, however, an indication that reported juvenile crime is increasing at a slightly faster rate in the rural parts of the country.

In summary, there appears to be a large, and mostly undetected, amount of youth crime in the nation. Most of these crimes are committed by boys, and the crimes predominantly involve the theft of property. Organized criminal activity and crimes of violence do not appear in the data as particularly significant aspects of delinquent activity. While narcotics do not appear to play an important part in delinquency, the use of liquor is a factor in about 6 percent of all arrests of boys. National statistics do not provide a basis for comment on the relationship of delinquency to demographic variables such as socioeconomic status or racial and ethnic factors; these will be discussed in Chapter 9 on the basis of field study information.

PART III FINDINGS AND RESULTS OF THE FIELD STUDIES

Chapter 6

DESCRIPTION OF FIELD STUDIES AND STUDY SITES

The Field Studies

One of the major tasks of the study was to conduct case studies in ten locations throughout the country. The method by which the following ten sites were selected is described in detail in Chapter 1, under "Method of Approach."

Cities	Counties
Boston, Massachusetts	Kanawha County, West Virginia
Charleston, South Carolina	Lane County, Oregon
Cleveland, Ohio	Maricopa County, Arizona
Flint, Michigan	
New Orleans, Louisiana	
Oakland, California	
Winston-Salem, North Carolina	

One or more members of the project staff spent several man-weeks at each site and gathered such reports and other data as were available. In some cases, tabulations or other special analyses were performed at the site. In addition, a large number of persons were contacted and interviewed to obtain opinions and other qualitative (as well as quantitative) data. The list of persons varied with each site, but in general, the following types of personnel are typical of those contacted:*

Educational personnel	general administrative
	attendance
	guidance
	special programs
	research

* Depending on the location, persons interviewed were at the state, county, city, or district level.

Employment service personnel	general administrative special youth programs counselors research and statistics
Juvenile and probation department personnel	administrative counselors research
Juvenile and other courts	judges court clerks
Police department personnel	administrative juvenile department research and statistics
Community special youth programs or projects	all levels
Welfare department	administrative child welfare
Labor union officials	
Employers	

Generally, contact was also made with persons at the highest level of local government, e.g., mayor, county supervisor, city council.

A number of problems were encountered during the field work, but it should be emphasized that local cooperation was not one. In every site, local personnel willingly extended a great deal of help to the study team. One type of problem encountered was that in some cases desired data were simply not available in any form. In other instances, extracting what was desired from the raw data that were available, e.g., examining all case records of delinquents, school records, or applications for employment, was beyond the limit of effort that could be expended in the area.

Another frequent problem was that sometimes data were available, but not in the desired form. For example, if a school census is available by age only and school enrollment by grade only, it is difficult to estimate the proportion of the total population that is in school, by either age or grade.

Still another problem was the question of comparability. Virtually no rules for data collection and maintenance were common to all of the study sites and agencies. While each case study was conducted as an

individual study (though standardized as to the types of data sought), the inevitable problem of comparability among sites is evident in the analyses and discussions in this part.

Description of the Study Sites

Table 1, page 8, contains much of the basic data characterizing the ten sites. For convenience, it is included again on the following page as Table 6, supplemented by two additional items--median income and percent of families with income under $3,000 in 1959.

Tables 7 through 10 present some additional material obtained during the field work from published sources, from observations made by the SRI teams or from opinions given by persons contacted in the ten locations. Whenever opinions and observations formed the basis for information, the results were checked against any available published documents, e.g., employment data from the 1960 census.

Although there was only limited variation in some factors (e.g., the minimum basic work age varies only between 14 and 16), the ten sites may be described as heterogeneous. There was large variation in such factors as the proportion of the population that was nonwhite, in the poverty group, etc. And while the school laws were similar in many ways, there was considerable variation in their enforcement; the same was true of the labor laws. Most of the sites are urban, but three contained a fairly large proportion of rural residents. The similarity of results from all the sites in the face of such basic differences provides some degree of assurance that the findings of this study can be generalized to other areas.

Table 6

SUMMARY DATA FOR LOCATIONS SELECTED FOR FIELD STUDY
1960 Data Unless Otherwise Noted

Study Site	Total Population	Urban Population as Percent of Total	Legal Data: Compulsory Attendance Age	Legal Data: Minimum Basic Work Age	Legal Data: Juvenile Court Jurisdictional Age (Male)	Male Population, Age 14-17: Total	Male Population, Age 14-17: Percent Nonwhite	Male Population, Age 14-17: Percent in Labor Force	Male Population, Age 14-17: Percent out of School	Overall Unemployment Rate	Delinquency Rate, Male	Median Income of Families, 1959	Percent of Families with Income under $3,000, 1959
Boston (City), Massachusetts	697,197	100.	16	16	17	18,651	8.9%	31.6%	(U) 2.1%	5.0%	1.8%	$5,747	16.7
Kanawha County, West Virginia (Charleston)	252,925	66.8	16	16	18	8,524	5.3	15.7	(C) 15.0	6.1	1.3	5,862	21.1
New Orleans (City), Louisiana	685,050 (1965)	100.	16	16	17	17,902	39.1	16.9	(U) 14.2	(S) 4.3 (6/65)	1.0	4,807	27.8
Lane County, Oregon (Eugene)	183,806 (1965)	61.1	18	14	18	5,431	0.6	28.9	n.a.	9.0	3.3	5,946	11.8
Flint (City), Michigan	200,000 (1965)	100.	16	14	17	5,209	17.0	28.9	(U) 14.3	(C) 2.8 (1964)	0.7	6,340	12.9
Maricopa County, Arizona (Phoenix)	663,517	86.5	16	14	18	21,605	5.2	33.0	(C) 24.0	4.5 (1964)	5.5	5,896	19.1
Charleston (City), South Carolina	79,200 (1964)	100.	none	16	18	2,167	54.1	n.a.	n.a.	6.5	n.a.	3,708	40.9
Oakland (City), California	385,700 (1965)	100.	16	15	18 (21)*	9,098	29.3	24.3	n.a.	9.6 (1964)	4.2	6,303	17.3
Cleveland (City), Ohio	811,050 (1965)	100.	18	16	18	21,458	28.3	26.9	(U) 9.1	(G) 2.3 (6/65)	1.1	5,935	17.2
Winston-Salem (City), North Carolina	138,872 (1964)	100.	16	16	16	3,237	42.0	27.7	n.a.	(S) 3.8 (5/65)	1.1	5,317	23.1

Notes: n.a. = not available.
U = Data are for urbanized area.
C = Data are for the city.
S = Data are for the SMSA.
Co = Data are for the county.
G = Greater Cleveland area.

* Although 21 is the statutory age in California, in the courts, practice is to handle persons 18 years of age and older as adults.

Source: Compiled and calculated by Stanford Research Institute.

Table 7

ECONOMIC FACTORS IN THE STUDY SITES

Study Site	Employment Base	Growth or Decline Factors
Boston	Manufacturing was previously prominent, but has moved, though it is still important in nearby areas. Manufacturing and trade have decreased; other industries have increased.	Finance, insurance, government, utilities, and services are growing. Population has decreased. While there has been a shift in the employment base, employment has been relatively stable.
Kanawha County	A major industry is the manufacturing of chemicals.	Industry, employment, and population are changing very little.
New Orleans	A variety of industries exist: services for tourism, the Port of New Orleans, a wide range of manufacturing including the petrochemical complex, and a large NASA installation.	The economy appears to be growing at a healthy pace.
Lane County	Major industries are lumbering and wood products. There is large summer employment in agriculture.	The population is increasing and employment seems to be keeping up with the pace.
Flint	Almost entirely based on automobile production and related industries.	The economy is reasonably stable though it fluctuates somewhat depending on the auto market. It has been growing over the last few years.
Maricopa County	The economy is varied. There is quite a bit of manufacturing. Agriculture is also important. There is fairly substantial employment in government.	The economy appears to be growing, especially in manufacturing, trade, services, and government.
Charleston	The city is primarily a center for banking and commerce. The county, however, has major manufacturing and utilities employment.	The economy in the county appears to be stable, but there is some evidence of decline in the city.
Oakland	The economy is diversified with various types of manufacturing and other industries. A comparatively large proportion of employed persons are in service industries.	The economy is declining. Many industries have moved to nearby areas. Population increased 45,000 from 1960 to 1964, but employment increased by less than 1,000.
Cleveland	Major industries are the manufacture of iron and steel and manufacturing and fabrication of metal products.	Employment in the city exceeds total population. Employment is high and rising, and unemployment is declining.
Winston-Salem	The base is varied. Among a variety of of manufacturing industries, textiles are prominent. Also considered important are tobacco products and telephone equipment.	Not much information is available, but it appears to be growing.

Table 8

ENFORCEMENT OF SCHOOL ATTENDANCE AND CHILD LABOR LAWS IN THE STUDY SITES

Study Site	Enforcement of School Attendance Laws	Enforcement of State Labor Laws
Boston	There are 37 attendance officers. However, it appears to be reasonably easy for a youth with problems (e.g., academic, behavioral, psychological) to get out of school.	Violations of age limit (12) for bootblacks are frequent. School attendance personnel supervise labor laws. It seems probable there are many violations because enforcement personnel are thinly spread.
Kanawha County	Enforcement is quite rigid for youth known to schools, but there may be some unknown. Among 17 attendance officers, one visits each school each week.	There appear to be few violations, although enforcement officials are thinly spread.
New Orleans	The laws are enforced, but a youth who wants to leave can become a behavior problem and be legally released.	The laws appear to be enforced as rigidly as possible with 6 inspectors in the city. Most violations are unintentional by employers.
Lane County	The laws are highly variable in interpretation. The laws are enforced uniformly, but some schools release youth readily while others do not. Some small districts have no attendance officers.	Enforcement officers try hard but are thinly spread. There probably are some violations in hazardous occupations--especially lumbering.
Flint	Laws are rigidly enforced, and there has been great effort to reduce dropouts. An extremely high proportion of those in the compulsory age limits are in school.	There is one enforcement officer one day per week. Enforcement appears to be limited.
Maricopa County	There is great variation among the various schools. Some enforce rigidly while others are lax.	The law is clear, but there is no information on how it is enforced.
Charleston	There are no attendance laws.	There are few enforcement personnel. Hiring of youth is often dictated by needs of industry.
Oakland	On paper, laws appear to be rigidly enforced. But this would seem a practical impossibility since over half the school population moves annually. There are seven attendance officers.	Where possible, the laws are enforced and followed, except that work permits are often used illegally by youth for more than one job, and many youths work without permits.
Cleveland	School laws appear to receive careful, persuasive enforcement. There are 36 attendance officers for 176 schools.	There appear to be few violations.
Winston-Salem	Little information is available. Appointment of attendance officers is at local option. The laws are probably enforced fairly well.	The number of investigations is small. However, the number of violations is also probably small. Organizations with a record of violations are checked often.

Table 9

CONSTRAINTS ON YOUTH EMPLOYMENT IN THE STUDY SITES

Study Site	Constraints on Youth Employment
Boston	Most high school graduates can find jobs. Most of the jobs available for dropouts are menial positions in hospitals, department stores, and restaurants. However, the department stores maintain a collective blacklist of all persons ever caught shoplifting.
Kanawha County	Most plants are unwilling to hire persons younger than 18 to 21 years. The remaining jobs are menial and low paying. There are few good jobs for anyone under 18.
New Orleans	Most jobs available to youth are low paying and temporary. Employers will choose an older applicant (over 22 years) if given the choice.
Lane County	Many jobs are, or are believed to be, hazardous under federal law.
Flint	Many jobs in the automotive industry are hazardous, but these employers currently require high school graduation for all jobs. Any jobs available to youth tend to be menial, low paying, and temporary.
Maricopa County	It appears that jobs for youth are scarce. The state employment office is able to place only a fraction of applicants under 17. Half of the dropouts under 21 who were known to the employment office in 1962 were unskilled or semiskilled, while only 35 percent of all employees in the county in 1961 were in those categories.
Charleston	There are few legal constraints. However, there is a shortage of jobs, even of the car-wash type. Thus many youth, especially Negroes, "hit the streets" (e.g., become shoeshine boys).
Oakland	The industries that are growing require skilled people. Employers prefer to hire older students (e.g., college students) rather than minors.
Cleveland	Most skilled and semiskilled jobs require a high school diploma. Many other jobs are service types, which are often seasonal or temporary.
Winston-Salem	There is a labor surplus, so dropouts are unable to compete. Some jobs are hazardous. Some employers won't hire youth in hopes they will stay in school. There are almost no jobs that hold a future available to dropouts.

Table 10

TRENDS IN DELINQUENCY RATES IN THE STUDY SITES

Study Site	Trends in Delinquency Rates
Boston	No information on trends was available.
Kanawha County	No information on trends was available.
New Orleans	The rate has been relatively stable for offenders (boys and girls) for ages 10 through 16 and for male offenders ages 12 through 15.
Lane County	The rate is increasing slightly faster than the rate of population growth in the appropriate age groups.
Flint	The rate has been quite stable since 1960, although it increased somewhat in 1964.
Maricopa County	Appears to be stable relative to population growth.
Charleston	No information on trends was available.
Oakland	There has been a steady increase both in arrests of youth and in organized, gang-type activity.
Cleveland	Delinquency rate appears to be increasing much faster than the rate of population growth in the appropriate age groups.
Winston-Salem	A steady increase in arrests appears to be at a higher rate than population growth.

Chapter 7

SCHOOL ATTENDANCE AND COMPULSORY EDUCATION LAWS

The progression from first grade through high school has come to be one of the most "natural" and expected sequences of the life cycle for the average American. Most parents, without the intervention of civil authority, would personally insist that their children attend school and would probably press them to do well in their studies. Throughout the country, parents and other citizens rise in public protest when they perceive real or imagined threats to the opportunities for certain children to receive an adequate education.

In view of this situation one might well ask why the statutes of the states must contain "compulsory education laws" as a legal insistence that children attend school regularly to some age limit. And one might also ask why these statutes must also contain specifications of personnel, procedures, and penalties to ensure that the laws are enforced. The remainder of this section will attempt to answer these and other questions on the basis of the information gathered and the experience gained in the project field studies.

The Attendance Laws

In the ten locations studied in this project, the school attendance laws varied in stringency from those of Ohio and Oregon, which require compulsory attendance until age 18, to those of South Carolina, which have had no compulsory attendance provisions since 1955. The remaining seven locations have laws that require attendance to age 16. However, the sites selected varied considerably both in the legal provisions for exemption of children from the attendance laws and in the manner and rigor of enforcement of the laws. While most of the study sites have laws that make high school graduation, regardless of age, equivalent to meeting the compulsory attendance age requirement, only Ohio has a compulsory age range (6-18) that is adequate to span the full 12 years of education normally needed to graduate from high school. Thus, only in Cleveland would a child's strict observance of the attendance law lead to graduation from high school. The following listing indicates for the ten field sites the compulsory attendance age span and the highest grade that would have been completed by a child who entered school at the specified beginning age, progressed normally, and left school at the earliest legal age.

Location	Compulsory Age Range	Highest Grade Completed
Cleveland	6-18	12
Lane County	7-18	11
Flint	6-16	10
New Orleans	7-16	9
Winston-Salem	7-16	9
Kanawha County	7-16	9
Boston	7-16	9
Oakland	8-16	8
Maricopa County	8-16	8
Charleston	none	none

From the above it appears that the legislatures of the various states do not see the compulsory education laws as vehicles for ensuring that all persons obtain the equivalent of a high school education. In most places a child who attended school only in compliance with the letter of the law would finish his education at the end of the eighth or ninth grade.

However, it should not be concluded that lawmakers or educators consider such an educational level to be adequate or desirable; in no instance during the field study interviews was such a position taken by a public agency or official; informants unanimously held the opinion that a high school education, or its equivalent, is an absolute necessity for the economic and social survival of a youth in our present economy. Emphasis is placed on the underlined phrase because the informants were almost equally unanimous in the opinion that a traditional academic high school education is not the proper prescription for all children. As one superior court judge told us, "An academic curriculum is wasted on two-thirds of the students." In general, the educators saw their task as that of keeping children in school through high school, and they expressed the general opinion that laws alone would never provide the answer. The following quotations offer insight into the opinions expressed:

> "The laws don't make the difference, they're arbitrary. Make it 21, or write them off the books. It's whether the school has anything to offer the kid that determines whether he stays."

> "The law is bad. How do you keep a kid in school if he can't make it?"

> "Good to have a compulsory attendance law through high school--provided those who can't make it get into a special program."

> "I don't think you can make a kid stay in school."

"I don't like the age rule; it gives a dropout a target to shoot for."

Another opinion widely held by the informants was that an increase in the compulsory age range with strict enforcement and without a change in curriculum offerings would only lead to more failure, dissatisfaction, and hostility toward school among the children who would ordinarily have dropped out at the earlier age. It was also felt that the child should be released who is continually failing and for whom the school has nothing to offer that he can grasp and retain.

However, a considerable body of national opinion holds that the incidence of dropout is curbed by the operation of compulsory school attendance laws and that any relaxation in enforcement, modification of conditions, or outright suspension of the laws would produce an adverse effect on school attendance. Indeed, national statistics show a marked increase in the dropout rate at age 16, the upper age limit in most jurisdictions that have compulsory attendance laws.

Since these laws presumably operate to hold young people under 16 in school, many individuals have offered proposals (ranging from statements of opinion to draft legislation) that the maximum age for compulsory attendance be raised to 17 or even 18 years for those who have not graduated from high school. Proponents of this course argue that, under present age limits, young people withdraw from school only to enter a limbo where restrictions on conditions of employment and lack of employment opportunities establish a climate of inactivity and restlessness that is favorable to juvenile offenses.

Opinions solicited on this subject varied widely; some jurists favored such an increase in the age limit and cited the arguments mentioned above. Educators, however, were divided. Many saw this approach as a redefinition of the function of public schools, an implication that schools should serve a detention, as well as an education, function. These educators strongly resented any such interpretation of their role; as one put it, "keeping kids at 17 or 18 when they want out would make our classrooms armed camps; it's hard enough to hold them right now at sixteen." They observed that, while schools are designing special courses, emphasizing counseling, and introducing more remedial programs, they are really powerless under current laws to hold the youngster who is determined to leave, and age extension will not change this situation.

When legislation to increase the compulsory school age from 16 to 17 years was introduced in Michigan in 1964 (S.B. 1408), a questionnaire survey of all local school superintendents showed that only 99 of the 400 respondents favored the proposed age extension.* The survey also showed

---

* State of Michigan, Dept. of Public Instruction, A Study To Gather the Opinions of School Superintendents in Regard to an Extension of the Compulsory School Attendance Age, Research Study No. 16, December 1963.

that the average cost per pupil, as estimated by school superintendents, would be $550, and the total cost of extending the school attendance age would be approximately $8 million. This latter figure, however, did not include funds for equipment, staff additions, and curriculum changes. While a large number of the superintendents who had been originally opposed would have agreed to the age increase if provisions for state funds were also included, a majority of those who changed their opinion were from districts in which only 25 or fewer pupils would have been added to the rolls in the event of an age increase. Significantly, the survey failed to obtain responses from the four largest districts in the state, which together accounted for over 56 percent of the total school membership. Since there was no conclusive evidence of educational community support for the proposal and since the financial implications were substantial, the bill never reached a legislative vote.

School Attendance and Dropouts

For a variety of reasons, completely comparable statistical data for all ten school systems studied could not be collected, and thus it was not possible to conduct analyses of school holding power, enrollment rates, or dropouts against compulsory attendance ages. For example, Charleston reports dropout rates in terms of percent of first graders surviving to graduation, whereas the schools in the Phoenix area report dropouts in terms of withdrawals as a percent of high school enrollment. However, by approximating a reduction of the various estimates of student retention to a common basis, it is possible to make some statements concerning the relationships of attendance laws to actual student behavior. Table 11 presents information for the ten study sites covering (1) compulsory attendance age (age at which a child may leave school legally), (2) best estimates of comparable dropout rates (percentages of enrollees in grades 9-12 who leave school before graduation), and (3) estimates of the degree of effort directed toward enforcement of the attendance law (mostly on the basis of information gathered during field interviews, but in some cases on the basis of statistical data concerning enforcement activity).

The data in Table 11 make difficult a conclusion that compulsory attendance laws are, in and of themselves, critical determiners of whether children attend school or not. The fourth highest dropout rate is reported for Cleveland, which has as stringent an attendance law as exists in the nation and where great effort is exerted to enforce the law. Lane County, with a comparable law and less opportunity to enforce, has a very low dropout rate. Charleston, where no law exists and where enforcement must be semilegal at best, does not fare badly in the general comparison of dropout rates.

Table 11

RELATIONSHIP OF ATTENDANCE LAWS TO RATE OF DROPOUT
OF MALES IN GRADES 9 THROUGH 12

Study Site	Compulsory Attendance Age	Estimated Dropout Rate	Estimate of Attendance Law Enforcement Effort
Cleveland	18	8.0 %	High
Lane County	18	4.0	Moderate
New Orleans	16	5.4	High
Flint	16	11.0	Very high
Maricopa County	16	11.0	Low
Kanawha County	16	4.9	High
Oakland	16	10.0	Moderate
Winston-Salem	16	3.4	High
Boston	16	6.8	Moderate
Charleston	none	10.00	Moderate

Admittedly, the enforcement data presented in Table 11 are not conclusive, nor can the dropout rates be treated as completely reliable comparative data. The methods by which the indices were derived varied from place to place, and the approximations in the table represent an attempt to reconcile the differences. For example, the Charleston rate was derived from data on the 12-year survival of students entering the first grade; the rates from Oakland represent enrollees who left school during the school term. In Flint, data include enumeration of all known students who terminated education, including those who "disappeared" during summer vacations; these students are traced to determine whether they have enrolled in some other school system. Most places ignore such between school year losses and calculate rates only for those who have enrolled in the local system at the beginning of each school year.

Another problem in interpreting rates by location is that there is much internal variation that is masked in location aggregates. In Phoenix (Maricopa County), one high school, which serves a largely Mexican-American population characterized by severe economic and social

disadvantage, has a dropout rate of approximately 20 percent per year. In another section of Phoenix, a school serving the census area with the highest per capita income and educational level of the city shows a dropout rate of 3.1 percent. Similar variations exist in other places; for example, an Oakland high school serving an attendance area populated largely by disadvantaged nonwhite students had a dropout rate, estimated by officials, of 28 percent.

Another problem that clouds the meaning of the data in Table 11 is the relationship of the age laws to the ages at which children drop out. In Flint, 85 percent of all dropouts are older than the legal age of 16, and in Winston-Salem, the percentage is 93. In contrast, Cleveland students appear to drop out in the same grades as in Flint and Winston-Salem, but at ages below the compulsory attendance age. In Charleston, with no legal age restrictions, informants reported that a heavy proportion of all dropouts occur by the eighth grade.

Much of the ambiguity of these analyses could be removed if it were possible to obtain accurate data on the child population and on age-by-grade enrollments; however, such data are not available for all the study sites. Only in Cleveland was the study team able to gather data that permitted calculation of the actual proportion of children of any specific age who were enrolled in school. Here, with compulsory attendance to age 18 and an 8 percent dropout rate, only two-thirds of all eligible children between the ages of 10 and 17 were actually enrolled in school.

The attempts during the field work to determine the degree to which school laws affect the behavior of youth have suggested certain conclusions concerning the seeming morass of school attendance statistics. The variations and inconsistencies across the nation in the manner in which enrollment data are reported and in the ways in which indices of student retention and dropout are calculated make it seem an impossible task to develop comparative quantitative data on school attendance, attendance rates, or the phenomenon of dropping out.

The Effects of Repeal of School Laws

Situations in two of the field study sites call into question the premise that compulsory attendance laws affect school attendance rates to any significant degree. Louisiana in 1964 reestablished the law making school attendance compulsory from age 7 through 15; this law had

been suspended through state legislative action in 1962.* This situation permitted a before-and-after comparative examination of attendance rates as part of the New Orleans field work. There has been no compulsory attendance law in South Carolina since 1955; thus, the study of Charleston also involved law/no law comparisons.

In New Orleans, total school enrollment over the past five school years shows a net increase of 12,663 students, from 145,754 in the 1960-61 school year to the 158,417 reported for 1964-65. This increase corresponds to the population growth for the same period. More specifically, the growth in total male enrollment in junior and senior high school grades 7th through 12th has kept pace with the population growth, as is shown in the tabulation below:

Male Student Enrollment in New Orleans (Grades 7-12)

	1960-61	1961-62	1962-63†	1963-64†	1964-65
White	17,057	17,592	18,012	18,259	18,088
Negro	9,270	10,070	10,811	11,947	12,540
Total	26,327	27,662	28,823	30,206	30,628

During each of the past four school years, student dropouts have amounted to about 2 percent of the total school enrollment for the year. Differences from year to year have been only fractional, as shown below:

School Year	Total Enrollment	Total Dropouts	Dropouts as Percent of Enrollment
1964-65	158,417	3,360	2.1%
1963-64†	157,577	3,158	2.0
1962-63†	153,156	2,756	1.8
1961-62	149,078	2,862	1.9

* There have been legal opinions rendered that the compulsory school attendance laws of Louisiana were in force during this period (by inference from sections of the statutes not repealed). However, documents from that period collected in New Orleans and the opinions of persons interviewed there indicate that there was a general belief by school and legal officials that the attendance laws were not in effect and that they could not be legally enforced (e.g., the local courts refused to accept truancy cases, and Visiting Teachers assumed that they had no legal powers to support them).

† Compulsory school attendance law suspended for these school years.

Note that, in the above tabulation, the most favorable situation regarding dropout occurred in 1962-63, a year in which attendance was noncompulsory, and the highest rate occurred in 1964-65, a year in which the compulsory attendance law was in effect. This is not intended to suggest that fewer dropouts occur when there is no requirement for compulsory attendance, but rather to illustrate that, in this New Orleans situation, the existence or nonexistence of an attendance law apparently had little effect either on enrollment or on dropout rate. This observation also holds true when the dropout population is analyzed in terms of the student age at the time of dropout. In 1962-63, a nonlaw year, 38.3 percent of the dropouts were less than 16 years of age, but in the following year, also a nonlaw year, the under-16 age group accounted for only 29.7 percent of the dropout population. The school attendance law applied once again in the 1964-65 school year, yet the under-16 age group had risen to 34.6 percent of the dropout population.

School attendance in Charleston, South Carolina, has been "voluntary" since the repeal of the state compulsory attendance laws in 1955. Despite this lack of a compulsory attendance law, cases of truancy are investigated and, in aggravated situations, the school representatives have the power to file neglect charges against the parents of the truant child. However, the number of such cases reported over the past few years is quite small.

Unfortunately, school census data are not maintained for Charleston, and enrollment figures are not broken down sufficiently to permit an analysis similar to that developed for New Orleans. Nevertheless, it is known that the population of the area has remained stable for more than a decade, and it appears reasonable to assume that this stability also applies to the school-going age component of this total. The review of available vital statistics during the field research tended to support this general assumption.

A survey of school enrollments from 1954 to the present showed remarkably little fluctuation; there was a drop in white enrollment in public primary schools, but this was countered by a gain in the enrollment totals for white private schools. Most important, however, is the fact that the repeal of the attendance law was not followed by any mass exodus of school-age youth from school; the change in total enrollment from year to year consistently falls below 1 percent.

Although these data concerning Charleston and New Orleans are far from conclusive, they do call into serious question the entire meaning and utility of compulsory attendance laws. It seems rather pointless to argue the relative merits of an age 16 versus an age 18 compulsory attendance law if, in fact, it makes no difference whether or not there is an attendance law at all.

These observations should not be construed as an endorsement of repeal of all compulsory attendance laws. Rather, they are intended to point out that there would seem to be factors other than the existence of school laws that determine school attendance by children. In view

of these rather unexpected findings, these cases deserve further study. A study of New Orleans would be particularly worthwhile since a law/no law/law situation obtained there for the years 1961-65. Such a study would have to be much more intensive than was possible during the present research and would have to develop detailed historical information on the before/during/after situations, particularly with regard to such factors as truancy procedures used during the repeal period and public and official attitudes and actions.

Enforcement of Attendance Laws

It is axiomatic that the functional meaning of the attendance laws exists in their enforcement. In the course of this study, it was found that an assessment of degree of enforcement was extremely difficult--in fact impossible in most places if one insists on hard, factual data. Most of the information on this topic was developed through interviews and observations. It was found that the average school district contacted did not collect and maintain usable records on such things as truancy contacts by attendance workers or, especially, the number of truant children returning to school.

Procedures for enforcement in the ten sites were found to vary greatly. Kanawha County has a particularly efficient program of enforcement. The school system is well staffed with an attendance director and 17 attendance officers. These officers are well trained and adopt a case work-counseling approach to the handling of truancy. During the last school year, this staff handled about 4,800 referrals of boys for truancy; of these, only 1,600 were found to be in violation of the attendance law. And of these 1,600 cases, only 87 were eventually referred to court. Thus, even when the referrals of girls are added, the actual case load of the officers is small enough to permit them to work seriously with the referred children. (In another site understaffing was so severe that attendance counselors averaged only 15 minutes of counseling with each case.) Although it is difficult to assess the effect of such enforcement procedures, it is significant that Kanawha County has a very low dropout rate.

On the other hand, Flint, which has essentially the same attendance law and also serious and competent enforcement, shows a much higher dropout rate. However, it is estimated that a greater proportion of the children of school attendance ages are enrolled in school in Flint than in Kanawha County. In the attempts to compare attendance and dropout data for the various locations, such paradoxes were not unusual.

At the opposite extreme, Maricopa County has perhaps as high a dropout rate as any site studied. It has a law requiring attendance until age 16; however, the law excuses from attendance any child over 14 who is employed, and the law also includes certain other exemption provisions that are open to wide interpretation by local school officials. Many persons interviewed felt that little serious effort is made to enforce the

attendance law. The attendance function is greatly understaffed, and many schools have no attendance-enforcement capability. Many schools resort to the practice of referring truancy cases to the county probation department, which actually has no jurisdiction unless a court has placed the child on probation. Many informants also referred to a general public apathy toward the school attendance problem; a phrase heard repeatedly in discussing this topic was "Who cares?"

A critical issue in the overall enforcement problem concerns the question of school census data; very few places appear to have valid and current data on the total school age population. Without knowledge of who should be in school, it is difficult to see how an attendance law is to be implemented. This would be analogous to a police department's attempting to enforce criminal laws when crimes were never reported to them--their function would be reduced to searching out known criminals who had escaped from detention. This study has shown that such is precisely the situation in most of the school districts studied. The vast majority (in some cases approaching 100 percent) of referrals to attendance and truancy personnel come from the schools themselves and involve truancy by enrolled students. Seldom are truancy cases encountered that involve children who have not registered for school. Such referrals are usually the result of chance complaints by members of the general public, almost never through the operation of a system for the identification of such children. Such a system is of course difficult to develop and implement, and only in Flint did it appear that such a system, built around the school census enumerations, was in successful operation.

Exceptions to the Laws

Critical to the enforcement of the attendance laws is the matter of "exception" provisions, which exist in the laws themselves. All of the locations studied, except of course Charleston, have some such provisions in their laws. Over the past ten years there has been a tendency for states to reduce the number of reasons for exemption in their school laws; however, a great number and variety of such exemptions are still in effect. Furthermore, the exemption provisions tend to be worded in a manner that provides great latitude for interpretation, usually at the discretion of local school authorities; thus, a child's opportunity for exemption is usually much greater than the law appears to allow. For example, in one location an apparently "tight" attendance law provided, reasonably, for the exemption of children whose "physical or mental condition" made school attendance unprofitable or impossible. In this location it was found that there were almost no expulsions or exclusions of students and that although there was no careful determination of dropout rates, they appeared to be quite high. It was discovered that, when it was determined that a child was an habitual troublemaker in his school and that his behavior was disruptive, the child was given the opportunity to apply for exemption by reason of a mental state that made it unprofitable for him to attend regular classes. The alternative offered by the school was expulsion--most of these children (and their parents) seem to have chosen to have the record show "withdrew" rather than "expelled."

In all of the locations studied, informants repeated the phrase "Any kid who wants to get out of school here, can." The rationale was that, if all else failed, the child, regardless of age or of the law, could make enough trouble for the school authorities so that they would permit him to drop out under an "unprofitable to attend" clause. If no such avenue were available, the child could always be expelled. In a majority of places studied, the normal punishment for serious or habitual truancy is suspension--often with the hope that the offender will not return the following semester to cause the school more trouble.

The following is a listing of the major provisions for exemption in the compulsory school attendance laws in the locations studied:

Maricopa County: (1) to enter employment if 14 years of age, (2) if further education would be unprofitable, (3) if the child has completed grammar school curriculum, (4) "other" acceptable reasons.

Lane County: (1) to enter employment if 16 years of age, (2) if further education is unprofitable and has completed eighth grade, or if over 10 years of age and mentally incapable of profiting, (3) for family hardship if eighth grade completed.

Boston: to enter employment at any age if this is determined best for the child's welfare.

Flint: (1) if certified by professional authority to be unable to profit, (2) if determined to be "unadjusted."

Kanawha County: (1) to enter employment if eighth grade completed, (2) if family is destitute.

New Orleans: (1) if certified professionally to be unable to profit, (2) if assigned to a school attended by a child of another race.

Oakland: if physical or mental condition makes it impossible or impractical.

Cleveland: if incapable of profiting.

Winston-Salem: if assigned to a school where the races are commingled.

Charleston: Not applicable.

The existence of an exception provision in the law, however, does not always mean that it is readily available to a child in the school system. In fact, the numbers or kinds of exemptions provided in the laws are found to bear no relationship to the incidence of dropouts in the locations. An exception to this may be Maricopa County, where the provisions for exemption at completion of grammar school and for "other

reasons" may apply to many situations involving Mexican-American children. It was found that the county experiences an unusually heavy loss of enrollment during grammar school, and several persons interviewed commented that many of the local children of Mexican origin reach school age with Spanish as their only language, and thus experience great trouble in the early grades.

In general, exemptions for employment require that the child hold a work permit and have the promise of employment. However, the discussions in Chapter 8 show that it is quite difficult for a 14 to 16-year-old to find employment, and therefore, this legal exemption is perhaps far less significant than it appears from the laws. Furthermore, studies of reasons for school dropout do not show employment as a really significant factor.

Flint's provision for exemption of "unadjusted" children appears at first glance to create weakness in the law. However, the Flint school system has a Personalized Curriculum Program and a vast array of special services for children who experience adjustment problems in the standard programs. It is seldom that a child is so classed, since the schools usually develop a program to which the child can adjust; thus, this exemption provision is seldom invoked.

In only two of the sites studied, Oakland and Maricopa County, was it found that exemption provisions were freely used. These places experience comparable problems--large racial or ethnic minorities suffering severe cultural and economic deprivation, extensive population growth, and high youth crime rates. Many youths appear to be unable to adapt and achieve under these conditions within the somewhat inflexible, traditional school systems. It was a common opinion among informants in these places that the interests of these children are not served by keeping them in a school situation where they can gain nothing and can only continue to fail.

These problems were common to some degree in all of the places studied, and there was a common opinion that youth who cannot cope with the academic school environment should not be kept in that school situation. It is recognized that turning these children onto the streets is not a solution, but in many places that is currently the only alternative. Rather, a solution is seen by most informants to be the development of school programs in which the child can achieve success and which will prepare him for successful entry into adult life.

Summary

The findings from the field studies indicate that, despite variation in the compulsory attendance age provisions of the school laws, the general policy in all study sites is to retain all students possible through the completion of high school. The age limits defined in the laws, and even the total absence of an attendance law, seem to have little bearing on the school attendance behavior of the children.

In most places studied, enforcement procedures seem adequate to deal with the truant enrolled student, but seldom is an enforcement system found that systematically handles the problem of the unknown, nonregistered child.

Authorities in the places visited are reluctant to have any changes made in attendance laws under present conditions. If it were possible to develop educational offerings that would meet the needs and be within the grasp of the present day dropout, authorities would encourage increases in attendance ages. However, they almost unanimously feel that, were such curriculum changes made, there would really be no significant need for attendance laws--the students would remain through high school of their own volition.

The exemption provisions of the laws are little used in most cases. They are generally invoked only in the case of the child who cannot adapt to the existing school curriculum or in the case where the best interests of the school and other students are served by releasing a particularly troublesome child.

To answer the two questions posed in the introduction to this chapter, compulsory school attendance laws and their enforcement procedures must currently exist because not all children or all parents perceive schooling as desirable or useful experience. The evidence seems clear that the vast majority of children are not really affected by the laws--they would, and in some cases do, go to school and graduate even if there were no laws. The evidence is equally clear that there is a small minority of children who will not go to school, or who will drop out of school before graduation, even in violation of the laws. There is, however, another minority of children who are adequate to the demands of school, but might be classed as "dropout disposed." These are the "fence-sitters" who achieve satisfactorily, but who would like to leave school; and these are the children for whom the laws have real meaning. Because of the existence of the attendance laws and because of their enforcement, these students are retained in school beyond the time when, in a totally free situation, they would have chosen to drop out.

Chapter 8

YOUTH EMPLOYMENT AND CHILD LABOR LAWS

Child Labor Laws

The Fair Labor Standards Act governs the federal child labor standards throughout the United States. In all of the sites the opinion of officials was that the FLSA was the primary law affecting work by youth in their areas. The situation, as seen by informants, is well summed up by a statement of one state labor commissioner, who commented, "perhaps 75 percent of the youth labor laws are covered by the federal regulations."

In general, state child labor legislation assumes that the FLSA is basic and extends comparable regulation to those situations not covered by the federal law. The state laws tend generally to cover not only the employment that is subject to the federal law, but also such other employment as that in small retail stores, hotels, restaurants, laundries, dry cleaning establishments, beauty shops, hospitals, recreation services, and certain hazardous occupations. They also tend to set maximum hours of work and night-work standards. Work by children in the street trades is often regulated by state law or local regulation. A significant function played by the state laws is the articulation of the child labor laws to the school attendance laws.

Whenever there is a conflict between the FLSA standards and the standards of a state law, the more stringent standard prevails. In half of the locations studied, the minimum age for work is lower than the federal standard of 16; thus, in these places the FLSA supersedes the local laws for much employment.

State laws are complex in that they deal with many specific occupations, have many exception clauses, and are highly interrelated with education laws. Table 12 attempts to summarize the major provisions of the local child labor laws that are effective in each of the study sites; however, this information is neither inclusive nor definitive of all of the local regulations.*

The summary statements of minimum age laws fail to show many interesting variations. For example, in many places the terms of the child labor laws are waived for a child who works for a parent, if the occupation is not hazardous. In some of the sites, certain officials are empowered to exempt children for various reasons, such as family hardship

---

* Chapter 4 lists sources of detailed information on state child labor laws.

Table 12

BASIC STATE MINIMUM AGE PROVISIONS FOR EMPLOYMENT IN THE STUDY SITES

Study Site	Nonagricultural Employment		Agricultural Employment	
	During School Hours	Outside School Hours	During School Hours	Outside School Hours
Boston	16 (factory) 14 (nonfactory)	16 (factory) 14 (nonfactory)	14	None
Charleston	16	16*	None	None
Cleveland	16	14	16	None
Flint	14	14	None	None
Kanawha County	16	16	None	None
Lane County	14	14	14	None
Maricopa County	14	14	14	None
New Orleans	16	16 (factory) 14 (nonfactory)	None	None
Oakland	15	14	15	12+
Winston-Salem	16	16 (factory) 14 (nonfactory)	None	None

* South Carolina. The 16-year minimum age outside school hours applies only to employment in a factory, mine, or textile establishment. There is no minimum age for other types of employment outside school hours.

\+ California. The minimum age is 12 during school vacations and on weekly school holidays and 14 at other times outside school hours.

or "for the welfare of the minor." In most sites there are special provisions for work in the street trades (e.g., newsboys and bootblacks), since these workers are considered to be self-employed and, thus, are not covered by the general child labor provisions.

There are also a variety of special regulations that might influence the employment opportunities of children. These include limitations on work past certain hours of the night, ranging usually from 6:00 to 10:00 p.m. for the different sites. The number of hours worked either by day or week is usually restricted, generally by imposing a limit that approximates a 40-48 hour week (including time spent in school). Most places permit children to work during school hours if they have been legally excused from school. However, an unusual situation obtains in New Orleans, where children between 14 and 16 may work up to 3 hours per day, but only after regular school hours--even if they are not required to attend school.

On the basis of the field work findings, it is concluded that these many variations and intricacies of child labor laws probably have little real effect on the work opportunities of youth except insofar as they serve to confuse labor and school officials and employers.

Enforcement of Child Labor Laws

The enforcement of child labor laws requires consideration of two factors, the work permit system and the procedures for inspection and enforcement.

Work Permits

A system of work permits (sometimes called employment certificates) is considered by most educators and officials interviewed to be highly desirable. It is felt that such a system helps to protect children from unscrupulous employers and protects employers from inadvertently breaking the laws. It is also felt that permit systems assist officials in overseeing and controlling the employment of youth.

The work permit is usually issued through an office of the local school district, which makes the determination of the legality of the employment for the child. In some places work permits are issued by labor offices; in these cases there is usually an additional step involved in which the school district must certify the educational status of the youth. In only one place studied, Winston-Salem, was another agency involved. In this city, work permits are issued by the County Welfare Department (by historical accident). Many persons in Winston-Salem reported that they felt that this system tended to discourage youths from applying for permits since locally there is a stigma attached to any dealings with "Welfare." These informants felt that this situation led to many youths' ignoring the law and working without permits. Charleston was the only place studied that did not use a work permit

system. There, it appears, the responsibility for determining legality devolves on the child and his employer. There is a regulation in Charleston requiring children who do business in the street trades to secure a license. According to informants, these licenses, which cost $5.00, are designed to permit some control over, and reduction in the large numbers of, children who work as bootblacks on the streets of the city. A similar "Minors License" is required in Boston for work in the street trades. While no fee is charged, a New Orleans boy must also obtain a street trades permit by submitting an application that includes a statement of parental approval.

Enforcement Procedures

The work permit system is one tool used in the enforcement of the state child labor laws, under most of which a work permit is required. (The FLSA does not require employers to obtain work permits or age certificates, but urges them to do so.) Prior review of the occupation in which the minor is to be employed and the certification of the age of the minor by the local issuing officer tend to curb illegal employment of minors. However, it is well accepted that not all children who are working are doing so legally. The Department of Labor publications that report on violations of the child labor provisions of the FLSA show about 10,000 cases annually of illegal employment of minors, and these are only the cases that have been detected. Information gathered in the present field studies indicates that this number represents only a fraction of the total problem.

The problem of detecting illegally employed youth is comparable to the detection of nonenrolled school age children or unreported cases of delinquency. No one knows who the children are, and in fact the responsible public agencies cannot even know that they exist in the absence of either adequate youth census information or complaints.

Inspection and enforcement of the provisions of the federal child labor laws are the responsibility of the Wage and Hour and Public Contracts Division of the Department of Labor. Inspectors of the WHPC operated in all of the places studied. In the course of their visits to many large establishments, these inspectors often uncover instances of illegal employment of minors. However, most violations are detected through the investigation of specific complaints. It was reported during the studies that the majority of these complaints come from competing establishments, labor unions, other children who were refused employment, disgruntled ex-employees, and parents.

In addition to the federal investigators, there are enforcement personnel representing state and local agencies. State labor agencies have inspectors who function similarly to the federal inspectors. For example, the State of North Carolina has 70 state inspectors in the field, while 30 federal inspectors work in the region. This was found to be an unusual situation; most states have far fewer inspection personnel in the field.

Louisiana and Oregon each have only 6 regional state inspectors. In Flint, it was reported that a state inspector spends one day each week in that area.

Much of the actual enforcement effort is carried out by school systems through the work of their attendance officers, who often have the responsibility for investigation of work permit applications. In Boston, for example, there are 35 supervisors of attendance who work in the field and deal with truancy, work permits, and child labor investigations.

In most of the places studied, federal and local agencies were making serious effort to enforce the child labor standards. It was also concluded that in no place were the responsible agencies actually in a position to investigate or enforce adequately. This is primarily the result of the ever-present shortage of personnel and funds, and public cooperation is always far from complete. A quotation from an official in Boston regarding enforcement of the requirement for licenses in the street trades highlights the problem, "It's impossible to enforce the laws. Why, you'd need a hundred attendance supervisors working all day at it to catch the kids who don't have permits and licenses." (A child with a minor's license is required to wear a badge while working. During the field work it was apparent that the official was correct, considering the large numbers of children seen on the streets hawking, selling newspapers, and bootblacking without badges.)

The Employment and Unemployment of Youth

The field work led to the conclusion that, at the present time, it is impossible to estimate the number of children less than age 18 who are (1) in the labor force, (2) employed, or (3) unemployed. In neither of the other topic areas under study, education and delinquency, was there such a dearth of information.

In most places the investigators were referred to the 1960 census as the only reliable source of information on labor force participation for the locality. In a few places aggregate estimates of employment, covering various age ranges (usually through age 22), were available, but these were of little value for the purposes of the study. Some places had more recent estimates from census or Department of Labor reports, but these invariably dealt with age ranges higher than those of relevance for the study. Most of the persons interviewed on this topic indicated a serious interest in the subject of youth unemployment, but they also indicated a sense of helplessness concerning the collection of reliable data. (In one state employment service an official reported that the local rate of unemployment of youth younger than age 18 was "16 percent." When queried further as to the source of this information, he finally stated, "Well, that's the national average, so it's probably about right.")

It had originally been hoped that data on issuances and denials of work permits would provide useful information concerning the employment

of youth. However, the results of the field studies indicate that such information is highly unreliable as an indication of the amount or kind of youth employment.

In the process of collecting reports and other information on issuances of work permits, the SRI field investigators did, however, obtain a good deal of information concerning the problem of work by youth. In each of the study locations, responsible officials reported the opinion that a very large number of children were working without work permits. In Oakland and New Orleans, these estimates ran as high as two-thirds; in other places, people tended to be reluctant to report numbers or percentages, and estimates ran from "lots of kids" to "there are undoubtedly some." A variety of explanations were advanced for this situation:

> "These kids are working illegally, so they aren't about to apply for a permit."
>
> "The employers don't want to have to pay Social Security on the kids they hire, and they don't want anybody to know."
>
> "The employers don't want anybody inspecting them."
>
> "They wait until they're sure that they want to keep the kid on permanently, then they go through the red tape."

In general, opinion was that children and employers tended not to apply for work permits if the work was illegal; if the employer would be involved in extensive "red tape" such as record-keeping and reporting; if it was not certain that the job would be permanent; if the employer had reason to avoid coming to the attention of official inspection agencies; or if the employer would be forced to pay minimum wages, social security, or insurance. In one study site a person responsible for work permit issuances reported, "During the season the farmers come in here [to town] and load the kids into trucks, and they pay them in pennies."

Everything considered, data concerning the numbers of work permits applied for or granted appear to be of little value in assessing the amount of employment of youth, and they are certainly of no relevance to the problem of unemployment. In most places permits are issued "automatically" if the employment is legal, but a child cannot apply until he has a promise of employment.

There are some interesting trends in the reports of work permit issuances that also cast doubt on the utility of such data. In the few places studied, where extensive effort had been expended in informing youth and employers about the permit system, there has been a slight increase in the numbers of permits issued over the past few years. However, it appears that in most places the issuance of permits has been declining relative to the youth population and to the number of children out of school. In Oakland and Boston, for example, there is a growing body of out-of-school youth younger than age 18, and many of these youth are working. However,

both of these places have shown a sharp decline in the absolute numbers of permits issued: in Boston, the number of permits and minors' licenses issued declined by 37 percent from 1963 to 1964; in Oakland the decline between 1962 and 1964 for full-time work permits was 42 percent.

Work permit data will likely become even less meaningful as youth work programs such as the Job Corps and the Neighborhood Youth Corps are developed. Since these programs adhere strictly to the work permit systems, there will be rapid increases in the numbers of permits issued. For example, on one day while the field work was under way in Boston, the work permit office planned to issue 600 permits for a Neighborhood Youth Corps project. Such increases will not reflect any real change in the regular employment picture for youth.

Nonlegal Factors Affecting Youth Employment

The results of the field studies have clearly indicated that there are many nonlegal constraints on the employment opportunities of youth, and the effects of these significantly outweigh any effects that the child labor laws might have. The chief of these factors are discussed below.

Lack of Salable Skills

Few children who come within the purview of the child labor laws have had the opportunity to develop skills or abilities that meet the demands of today's labor market. Most employers know this and will not even consider a boy less than 18 or who is not a high school graduate for any job other than simple "labor."

Many employment service personnel have reported this to be the case. In one city the employment service office noted that they usually had about 500 job openings that could not be filled, but that "dropouts just can't meet the qualifications." In general, local employment services in the places studied reported that they could find placements for only about 20-25 percent of the under-18 applicants. The common explanation was that "they have nothing to offer an employer."

Employer Attitudes

For reasons other than those noted above, employers are reported to have decidedly negative attitudes toward the hiring of youths for regular employment. Employers tend to see young workers as unpredictable, unreliable, and "short-termers." Also, it is a common belief among employment officials that employers are confused about, and have little grasp of, the child labor laws and that they refuse to hire young workers out of fear that they may "get into trouble with the law."

A case from one city studied illustrates the effects of these attitudes. A very large establishment in this city accounted for perhaps 20 percent of all employment. The following quotation is taken from the comments of a personnel supervisor at this establishment:

> "We have absolutely no policy against hiring school dropouts . . . we can't hire anyone less than eighteen because of the hazardous employment business. [This was not actually the case.] . . . Everyone we hire above the helper level has to have a high school diploma--that includes all of the office and clerical people too."

An employment service official in the same city reported:

> "Employers greatly discriminate in their choice of employees. They want somebody capable of promotion, who can read and write, and who is not shiftless. There are always plenty of applicants available, so the dropout is never considered."

The Attitudes and Behavior of Youth

From a purely objective and economic point of view, these employer attitudes are probably not wholly unreasonable. Young workers, particularly school dropouts, have acquired a rather unpleasant reputation with both employers and employment service personnel. During the field work, state employment service personnel consistently reported a strange phenomenon concerning dropouts. These boys are counseled when they leave school to register with the employment office; they register for work almost immediately--but they never reappear. They do not check back as instructed, nor do they return calls.

Youth seeking employment also seem to have totally unrealistic expectations of their potential earnings. Informants report that 15 to 17-year-old dropouts tend to expect to move into jobs that will immediately permit them to buy new clothes, new cars, and to be "big spenders." (In Phoenix it was reported, "all these kids want is to get out and get a job so they can pay for the 'glad wheels'.") In Flint it was reported that, when youth were actually placed on jobs, they did not stay. The explanation was as follows:

> "When the kids drop out they expect to go into the shops (auto plants) and make good money. When they find out that the best they can get is a job at $45 a week they take it, but by the end of the month, when they find out how much they have in their pocket, they quit. They never come back here."

In Boston, several persons used almost identical words:

> "These kids won't work for the minimum of $1.25 an hour. They try it for a while, but then they look around and discover that they can make more than that 'hustling' on the street--so."

A project carried out by the Alameda County Probation Department (Oakland) indicated a similar state of affairs.* This was a program of intensive job search for a sample of 100 juvenile parolees. Jobs that paid around $400 per month and that were considered to have good futures were found for all members of the study sample. Within a short time the majority of the sample had either quit or had been fired for cause.

Two Special Cases

Lane County and Hazardous Employment

A situation obtains in Lane County that indicates that, under certain conditions, the hazardous employment clauses of the state and federal labor laws may serve as a serious obstacle to employment opportunities for youth.

A large proportion of the economy of Lane County is based on lumbering, sawmilling, and the manufacture of durable wood products. In the western coastal part of the county, there is significant employment in occupations associated with the waterfronts and with seaborne operations (e.g., stevedoring, fishing, charter boats, shipping). It is estimated that these two types of activity provide well over half of the employment opportunities for untrained persons in the county. The largest portion of the jobs in these fields are covered by federal hazardous occupations orders that prohibit employment of persons younger than 18 years of age.

Lane County may be a case where the labor laws and their enforcement do narrow employment opportunities for youth who are less than 18 and who have no particular job skills or abilities. This is felt to be particularly true for the youth in the large rural areas of the county, where these prohibited occupations form nearly the entire employment market. Educators in the area expressed the opinion that the low dropout rates in these rural areas might be the result of the fact that there are no jobs available to youth and, thus, "until they're 18 there's nothing for them to do but go to school."

The New Orleans Case

Another aspect of the hazardous employment question is illustrated by a situation which developed in New Orleans in the summer of 1965. This case illustrates the extent to which employers are influenced to refrain from hiring youth as a result of the hazardous occupation orders. The New Orleans problem developed shortly after the President appealed

---

* Paul McCormick, Job Finding for Court Wards, Alameda County Probation Department, 1965.

to the nation's employers to create job opportunities for youth during that summer.

As a result of a sudden rash of industrial accidents involving children, New Orleans labor investigators discovered that a large number of very young children had been employed in hazardous occupations (e.g., working on scaffolding and cleaning bricks on construction sites). Some of the children involved were as young as 10 and 12 years of age and apparently were paid very low wages.

It was the opinion of informants in the city that this situation had developed from the employers' misinterpretation of the President's message, that the employers had read it to mean that the "bars were down" and that the government was encouraging the employment of youth wherever possible.

This case points up the degree to which the existence and enforcement of the hazardous occupations laws exclude youth from such employment. It implies that many employers would be willing to hire children for such work if the laws did not exist.

Summary of the Employment Problems of Youth

On the basis of the findings from the field studies, the federal and state child labor laws are not in general significant influences on the employment opportunities for youth. Many other factors seem to exert much more influence, among the more important of which are:

1. The availability of jobs suited to youth who have few job skills.

2. The attitudes of local employers.

3. The expectations and attitudes of the youth himself.

The field studies indicated that it is almost impossible to estimate the number of persons younger than age 18 in the labor force or the employment or unemployment rates for youth even for specific locations.

While all but one of the locations studied had a work permit system, it appears that a majority of working youth do not comply with the laws governing such permits and, therefore, that data concerning permit issuances are highly unreliable indicators of the employment of youth. Therefore, it is estimated that the majority of youth who are employed, are employed illegally, if only in that they lack permits.

Chapter 9

YOUTH OFFENSES AND DELINQUENCY

In the ten study sites the problems involved in collecting information relating to youth offenses and delinquency were somewhat less complex than those encountered in dealing with school and employment data. Most police departments and juvenile courts consider the collection and summarization of statistical data on the cases with which they deal to be indispensable to operating procedures. Thus, while these data were not always complete for the purposes of this study, it was usually possible to collect information in some detail on the portion of the youth population who had come into contact with law enforcement agencies. The detail in most cases was restricted to the types of offenses committed and to certain personal characteristics of the offenders such as age, sex, and race. It was unusual to find readily available police or court records of educational or employment status of the youth involved, since these do not relate directly to the operational problems of the enforcement agencies. Therefore, the collecting and reporting procedures of these agencies were not designed to include such information.

In general the data collected for the study sites closely parallel the national statistics, which were discussed in Chapter 5. However, in the course of interviews and discussions with enforcement personnel, a great deal of nonstatistical information was collected that is useful in interpreting the quantitative data.

The Incidence of Juvenile Offenses

Table 13 summarizes a part of the data gathered on the incidence of delinquency, and the nonavailability of data--even when sought through on-site methods--is clearly evident. This nonavailability resulted from several situations:

1. Rates and percents could not be computed when reasonably accurate population statistics were not available.

2. "Court cases" for two city sites were not available since such data were accounted only on a countywide basis and could not be obtained separately for cases arising from the specific cities.

3. Arrest and "police contact" data for some county sites were not obtainable since these records were maintained only by the many separate law enforcement agencies within the counties.

Table 13

ESTIMATED INCIDENCE OF MALE DELINQUENCY* IN THE TEN FIELD STUDY SITES
1964

Study Site	Jurisdiction Age	Number of Police Contacts	Number of Arrests	Number of Court Cases	Delinquency Rate	Minority as Percent of Arrests	Minority as Percent of Population
Boston	16	4,309	1,247	963	7.37%	32.4%	11.5%
Charleston	17	n.a.	714	n.a.	12.96	87.4	45.2
Cleveland	17	n.a.	2,046	n.a.	3.25	59.9	29.0
Flint	16	3,146	1,266	688	10.29	44.0	20.0
Kanawha County	17	n.a.	n.a.	829	n.a.	10.0	6.0
Lane County	17	n.a.	1,518	1,518	5.00	n.a.	n.a.
Maricopa County	17	13,863	8,931	7,333	16.00	30.0	12.0
New Orleans	16	n.a.	3,767	3,050	3.40	67.2	39.2
Oakland	17†	8,317	4,339	3,484	n.a.	69.3	45.0
Winston-Salem	15	648	n.a.	342	6.48	66.5	32.6

n.a. = not available.

* Excludes traffic, truancy, and neglect cases.
† In practice, although the law stipulates age 20.

Source: Stanford Research Institute.

4. In some cases, city police departments maintained records only for "arrests" of juveniles and did not record those "contacts" that did not eventuate in formal charges and bookings.

5. In Winston-Salem, the police juvenile records contained only recapitulations of "persons arrested--including those released without having been formally charged." (In this case, all of the data were included as "contacts.")

Nevertheless, the data presented in Table 13 and the subsequent tables in this chapter are felt to be the best available estimates of the nature and scope of the juvenile offenses in the locations studied, and this information is the basis for the discussion in this chapter.

The following descriptions define the information contained in the table:

Jurisdiction Age: the inclusive upper age limit for the jurisdiction of local juvenile authorities.

Number of Police Contacts: the total number of formal contacts between police and juveniles, regardless of whether formal charges were filed. This includes, for example, "reprimand and release" contacts where a formal report of the activity was filed.

Number of Arrests: the total number of arrests or juvenile contacts where a formal charge was filed and subsequent action taken. This includes, for example, cases where a petition was not filed with a court, but where the child was issued a citation or a notice to appear before a probation agency.

Number of Court Cases: the total number of cases handled by juvenile courts in a hearing before a judge or referee.

Delinquency Rate: an estimate of the number of arrests as a percentage of the child population between 10 years of age and the upper limit of police jurisdiction.

Minority as Percent of Arrests: arrests of persons identifiable as members of minority groups as a percent of total arrests.

Minority as Percent of Population: the estimated percentage of the total population identifiable as members of minority groups.

The variations in the data in this table are striking. Although the computation of statistical correlations was precluded by the quantity of nonavailable data, it is apparent from the table that variance in these data does not relate simply to the size, nature, or location of the study sites. For example, the three places with the highest rates of delinquency are Maricopa County, Charleston, and Flint--places widely divergent on geographical, economic, and demographic characteristics. Similar

disparity is seen among the three places lowest in delinquency rates--New Orleans, Lane County, and Cleveland.

Neither the data on incidence of law enforcement actions nor the delinquency rate are presented as indices of the absolute amount of criminal activity by youth in the ten areas. Other information collected in the course of the field studies suggests that such data result from the interaction of the true incidence of crime with local law enforcement policies and procedures. This can best be illustrated by some examples.

Flint provides an unusual case. From the data in Table 13, it appears that this city has quite a high rate of juvenile crime; however, during the field work there, it was concluded that Flint has no serious delinquency problem in contrast to other sites with much lower apparent rates. Flint has very rigorous law enforcement procedures; the slightest antisocial behavior is likely to bring a youth to the attention of the police. But the enforcement is also supportive and helpful. The philosophy and policy there is to take action at the first instance of a delinquent act by a child and to make every attempt to prevent recurrence of such behavior. When a child becomes a police "contact", he is immediately immersed in a program of counseling, special educational programming, or whatever is deemed required to help solve the problem. When the interviewer remarked that Flint did not appear to have a real delinquency problem, one police official replied, "Maybe that's because we worry so much about it."

The relatively high number of police contacts reported for Flint contains a very high number of larcenies, the vast majority of which involve the shoplifting of such items as packages of gum, candy bars, and inexpensive ball-point pens. One officer commented, "When we pick them up, these kids always have more than enough money in their pockets to pay for the item. Who knows why they do it? But we don't want them to get started that way." Flint also reports a higher proportion of assaults than most places studied. However, the field study disclosed that a large number of these cases represented after-school fistfights between individual teenagers. While Flint has a high rate of police contacts and arrests, it has a very small number of offenses serious enough to warrant action in the courts.

On the other hand, Oakland, because of a lack of youth population data, has an undetermined "delinquency rate"; however, we would estimate it to be half that of Flint. Oakland has serious and competent juvenile enforcement. Enforcement in Oakland is much "tougher" than in Flint, since it contends with a very different type of juvenile problem; for instance "assault" cases in Oakland data include significant numbers of juveniles who have engaged in organized and armed gang fights, strong-arm robberies, and planned assaults on police officers. Oakland has two and one-half as many police contacts as Flint, but five times the number of offenses serious enough to be referred to the juvenile courts.

Again it is clear from this discussion that a problem exists in assessing the meaning of statistics concerning youth offenses. This also

points to the need for a set of standards for collecting and reporting such data in forms that will permit careful analysis and comparison across jurisdictions. These field study findings also point to the need for a careful reappraisal of such terms as "juvenile delinquency," "youth offenses," and "juvenile crime." Many persons currently object to the use of terms such as "crime" or "found guilty" in connection with minors. They argue that, in strict legalistic terms, most juvenile court actions are not "criminal". While such arguments and usages may be appropriate in the conduct of legal actions, they place an unnecessary burden on attempts to study or understand the problems of youth.

The data in Table 13 (or, for that matter, in the Uniform Crime Reports) are subject to these kinds of definitional problems. When a reader cannot be sure whether the data listed in a table under the heading "assaults" describe acts with a criminal intent or whether they mostly comprise enumerations of school and playground fights, any discussion of the incidence of criminal behavior becomes academic.

Despite these shortcomings, the overall experience and information gained from the field studies suggest that the delinquency rate data in Table 13 are reasonable estimates of the amount of illegal behavior by youth that has come to police attention in the ten areas. For this reason these data are contrasted with certain characteristics of the school attendance and child labor laws of the study sites later in this chapter.

Age and Offenses

In all of the study sites, it was possible to collect information on the ages of children who came into contact with the law. Table 14 presents the age distributions of police contacts for the study sites. In general, the data in the table correspond closely to the national norms discussed in Chapter 5. The modal (peak) age for police contacts is at 16; over half of all contacts are with children in the 15-17 age range; and only a small fraction of all delinquency involves children younger than age 12.

Maricopa County and Oakland appear to have many more police contacts for children from the under-12 category than do the other sites. This finding for Maricopa County may be explained by the more detailed field study data, which show a very high proportion (17 percent) of all offenses classified as "carelessness or mischief." A comparable situation obtains in Oakland, where 6 percent of all offenses are listed as "malicious mischief" and 14 percent are for "loitering" (which includes curfew-type violations).

Table 14

AGE DISTRIBUTION OF
MALE POLICE CONTACTS, BY
STUDY SITE
(Percent of Total Juvenile Contacts)

Study Sites	Age						
	< 12	12	13	14	15	16	17
Boston	n.a.%	8.8%	9.4%	14.0%	19.5%	20.7%	27.6%
Charleston	15.1		22.0		15.1	26.1	21.7
Cleveland	n.a.	3.8	8.1	18.2	27.1	23.3	19.5
Flint	9.1	8.2	10.3	21.6	27.8	23.0	--
Kanawha County	9.0	4.0	8.0	15.0	17.0	23.0	24.0
Lane County	0.8	2.9	3.9	12.2	17.2	29.2	33.8
Maricopa County	20.0	7.0	8.0	10.0	15.0	20.0	20.0
New Orleans	n.a.	9.7	17.0	19.0	25.0	29.3	--
Oakland	15.1	6.7	11.5	16.1	17.6	17.6	15.4
Winston-Salem	18.0		27.3		13.6	18.4	22.7

n.a. = not available.

Source: Stanford Research Institute.

Types of Offenses by Youth

A summary of the types of offenses committed by youth in the ten study sites is presented in Table 15. These offenses are grouped into five general categories, as follows, plus a miscellaneous grouping:

Crimes Against Persons: includes homicide, rape, assaults, robbery.

Thefts: all larcenies except robbery and auto theft.

Auto Theft: includes unauthorized use, "joy-riding," and other auto theft.

Liquor and Narcotics Violations: all charges, including "glue-sniffing," but does not include "had been drinking" when no ABC violation was charged.

Table 15

MALE POLICE CONTACTS, BY TYPE OF OFFENSE AND STUDY SITE
(Percent of Total Juvenile Contacts)

Study Site	Crimes Against Persons	Thefts	Auto Theft	Liquor and Narcotics Violations	Antisocial Behavior	Miscellaneous
Boston	11.6%	55.6%	5.1%	2.2%	5.7%	19.8%
Charleston	4.2	43.1	3.1	1.4	30.8	17.4
Cleveland	11.0	29.8	22.6	1.8	24.2	10.6
Flint	8.6	43.0	20.6	4.3	23.5	
Kanawha County	6.0	36.1	9.9	4.2	14.9	28.9
Lane County	2.3	30.7	7.6	18.8	25.8	14.8
Maricopa County	0.2	33.4	4.7	9.6	20.7	31.4
New Orleans	5.9	47.3	16.0	3.1	13.2	14.5
Oakland	9.1	46.0	10.4	3.7	2.6	28.2
Winston-Salem	7.7	60.9	3.3	2.5	12.2	13.4

Source: Stanford Research Institute.

Antisocial Behavior: includes most offenses against the societal norms for the conduct of minors, such as runaway, curfew violations, incorrigible, mischief; does not include truancy.

The data in Table 15 are similar to the national findings reported in Chapter 5; in the table the predominant category of youth offenses is thefts. Furthermore, on the basis of other data and reports from the field work, it is clear that the vast majority of thefts by children are classifiable as shoplifting (mostly of items of negligible value) or bicycle theft. Also, most police personnel felt that many of the bicycle thefts, particularly those by young children, do not represent thefts with criminal intent, but rather "borrowing" or behavior akin to "joy-riding."

A similar situation holds for auto theft. Police and probation informants were generally agreed that this offense usually could be classified as "joy-riding" and that a minority of such offenses were committed with the intent to retain possession of the auto or to profit from the crime.

Thus, in our data the majority of youth offenses that come to the attention of police agencies are of a somewhat "minor" nature within the total crime picture. This does not imply that these offenses should be ignored, but only that major offenses and crimes against persons do not predominate among the offenses of youth. There appears no evidence in the results of the field studies that would indicate that there is any great amount of youth crime that represents hostility or aggression against the adult society or the social and economic system. Oakland is the one exception to this conclusion; there a trend is apparent toward increasing violence to persons and property (e.g., school vandalism) and particularly toward organized gang violence and aggression against the police. These trends in Oakland are most pronounced among the disadvantaged sectors of the youth population; however, such a trend among the disadvantaged is not seen in other study sites where equally large population groups suffer similar social and economic deprivation.

Delinquency and Minority Groups

The data derived from the field work, like most compilations of delinquency statistics, showed disproportionate frequencies of police contacts with youths from minority groups. Table 13 presented the proportion of arrested persons who were members of minority groups and the representation of such groups in the general population of the sites.

The distinguishing characteristics of the minority groups of most of the study sites was that they were nonwhite, and mostly Negro. In the one exception, Maricopa County, the significant minority group was of Mexican origin. In most of the study sites the members of these minorities tended to live in well-defined regions of the locality, sometimes in what local officials were willing to term "ghettos." These residence areas were also uniformly characterized by economic deprivation,

e.g., low family incomes, dilapidated housing. These conditions held also for the large Mexican-American populations of the Phoenix (Maricopa County) area, and these people suffered the same sort of social distinction found in many places between "whites" and "Negroes"--in the Southwest the distinction is made between "Mexican-Americans" and "Anglos."*

These remarks are of particular interest since the data presented in Table 13 indicate that the differential police contact rates for the minorities of Maricopa County are the same as for the Negro minorities of the other locations studied. Thus, any racial interpretation of the data on differential delinquency rates is precluded. However, all of the minority group living areas had the common characteristics of being in the "slums" of the area and of exhibiting severe cultural and economic deprivation of the population.'

The data in Table 13 showed that the rates of police contact with minority group youth are consistently on the order of 2 to 3 times the representation of the group in the population. Law enforcement and other officials in all of the sites were aware of this situation and were quick to point out the "area that gives us the most trouble." This situation can potentially become a self-fulfilling prophecy--i.e., police are aware that an area has more than its share of delinquency; therefore, they apply more enforcement control to the area and make more arrests, which in turn leads to a higher "delinquency rate" and confirms the original notion.

It is probably necessary and proper that more intensive enforcement be applied in areas known to have a higher incidence of offenses. However, such efforts may result in a misleading set of offense statistics. For example, in those areas of the sites that can be identified as "minority group areas," the information collected in the field studies (and, for that matter, in many other studies) indicates a pattern of high unemployment of youth, high dropout rates, lax enforcement of school and labor laws, and high juvenile offense rates. One might be led to conclude that these variables, which are in fact "correlated," are also causally related, since they occur together in all cases. Such a conclusion is, of course, unwarranted, and a more reasonable hypothesis would be that they are all results of some other more central, but unmeasured, factor or factors common to the situations.

Offense Rates and School and Employment Laws

Table 16 assembles data presented elsewhere in this report to permit some estimate of the degree to which juvenile offense rates are related

---

* See R. B. Choate and Lorraine W. Frank, National Conference on Poverty in the Southwest: Summary Report, The Choate Foundation, Phoenix 1965. This report provides an overview of the situation of the disadvantaged population of the area.

Table 16

DELINQUENCY RATES AND LEGAL AGES FOR SCHOOL ATTENDANCE AND EMPLOYMENT BY STUDY SITE

Study Site	Delinquency Rate	Compulsory School Age	Minimum Age for Nonagricultural Employment		Offenses by Persons Ages 16 and 17 as Percent of Total	School Dropout Rate	Level of School Law Enforcement
			During School Hours	Outside School Hours			
Maricopa County	16.0%	16	14	14	40.0%	11.0%	Low
Charleston	13.0	none	16	16	47.8	10.0	Average
Flint	10.3	16	14	14	23.0*	11.0	Very high
Boston	7.4	16	16	16	48.3	6.8	Average
Winston-Salem	6.5	16	16	16	41.1	3.4	High
Lane County	5.0	18	14	14	63.0	4.0	Average
New Orleans	3.4	16	16	16	29.3*	5.4	High
Cleveland	3.2	18	16	14	42.8	8.0	High
Kanawha County	n.a.†	16	16	16	47.0	4.9	High
Oakland	n.a.‡	16	15	14	33.0	10.0	Average

* Data not available on number of offenders age 17.
† Estimated to be moderate, perhaps on the order of 5 percent.
‡ Estimated to be high, perhaps on the order of 10 percent.

Source: Stanford Research Institute.

to characteristics of the laws governing school attendance and child labor in the ten study sites. In two sites, Kanawha County and Oakland, offense rates could not be computed since no determination of the child population at risk was obtainable.

The lack of variance in compulsory attendance age and in the minimum ages for employment in nonagricultural work precludes, in general, the computation of statistical correlations. However, it seems clear that no clear relationship exists between these age laws and the incidence of offenses. There is a very slight tendency for higher minimum ages to be associated with lower offense rates, but this is tenuous at best.

Neither do offense rates appear to be associated with the estimated degree of effort applied to enforcement of the school attendance laws. The three outstandingly high offense rates are for places with estimates of "low," "average," and "very high" degrees of enforcement of the laws.

The finding that more than 40 percent of offenses are committed by persons ages 16 and 17 also casts serious doubt that the school or work laws are related to offense rates. At these ages the offenders are above the minimum ages for work and, in most places, are above the legal minimum for leaving school.

The one clear relationship in the data in Table 16 is between offense rate and dropout rate. The Rank Difference Correlation between these two variables is +0.625, which indicates that the two are moderately highly related, high rates in one occurring with high rates in the other. This is a common finding and may be interpreted to mean that, in places where there are larger numbers of children leaving school before graduation, there are also higher incidences of delinquency. However, the finding does not imply a causal relationship.

This finding is subject to various interpretations, and the data from the present study do not permit a definitive conclusion. It may be that a third factor, such as economic deprivation, accounts for both phenomena; it may be that children who get into trouble with the law also get into trouble in the school situation. In several locations it was found that school administrations tended to encourage the dropping out of students who were troublemakers in school (i.e., such children become "pushouts").

Informants commonly felt that there is a relationship between dropout and delinquency, which operates in the following manner: The teenage child who is out of school and does not have a high school diploma has great difficulty in finding employment--not because of the laws, but because employers find him an unattractive applicant, primarily since he lacks skill and experience. Thus, the dropout youth is left to "wander the streets" without activity or purpose. Many informants, especially juvenile police and probation personnel, felt that this situation tends to make the youth a higher delinquency risk. They felt that a state of boredom is created in which the youth becomes susceptible to any opportunities that offer excitement and some sort of purposeful activity.

They also felt that such aimless youth tend to band together and become the nuclei of "gangs" in their attempts to relieve boredom and to find some meaningfulness in their lives.

In summary, this analysis gives no basis for a conclusion that school and labor laws or their enforcement bear any relationship to the incidence of youth offenses. Such a relationship may in fact exist, but no evidence to support such a conclusion was uncovered in the research. There does appear to be a relationship between school dropout rates and youth offenses. However, in view of the fact that dropout rates appear not to be related to school laws and in view of the several alternative explanations for the relationship, it is questionable to conclude that this correlation implies an effect of the laws on delinquent behavior.

Chapter 10

SPECIAL ANALYSES CONCERNING THE RELATIONSHIP OF DELINQUENCY TO SCHOOL ATTENDANCE AND EMPLOYMENT OF YOUTH

The Cleveland-Flint-New Orleans Investigations

The most detailed information on the relationship of dropout to employment and delinquency was developed through special studies made at three of the field study sites: Cleveland, Ohio; Flint, Michigan; and New Orleans, Louisiana. At these cities, detailed school, work, and police records were available, and waivers of the privileged information provisions of laws or policies governing this information were granted.

The general procedure involved a selection of a sample of male dropouts for the most recent year in which the detailed school data were available. If school information included an indication of the students' race, the sample was constructed to reflect this classification as well as the students' age. All individuals in the sample were identified by name, birthdate, and last known address to permit positive matching with work permit applications and juvenile police records.

For Cleveland, the sample of 67 cases represented 10 percent of the 670 male pupils who left school during the 1963-64 school year. In Flint, 99 cases were studied, representing a 50 percent sample of the 16-year-old boys who dropped out in the 1964-65 school year. The New Orleans sample of 95 male dropouts included 10 percent of all boys from ages 12 through 16 who left in the 1964-65 school year.

The Flint sample was limited to 16-year-old boys because (1) the number of dropouts younger than this age was quite small, and (2) available information on juvenile police contacts did not cover all boys older than 16. However, the age group used for the sample represented a substantial portion, about 40 percent, of the total number of boys who elected to leave school rather than continue until graduation.

School Experience

The age distribution of the students in the New Orleans and Cleveland samples is shown below. The New Orleans selection covered the 12-16 age group, since this included the upper limit of juvenile police authority as well as a major portion of the jurisdiction of the state child labor law. In Cleveland, where the compulsory attendance age is 18, selection was made on the basis of the dropout total without any attempt to exclude particular age groups from consideration.

	Student Age on Leaving School								
	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	Over 18	Total
New Orleans	3	4	11	23	54				95
Cleveland					3	23	23	18	67

The age-grade distribution of the dropouts studied clearly reflects a difference in educational philosphies between school administrations regarding student progression through school. In New Orleans, the student who fails to complete satisfactorily the academic work in a grade repeats that grade until he passes; in Flint, schools generally follow the principle of social advancement whereby a student is advanced to the next grade at the end of the school year. The effects of these differences are illustrated below, where the grade distribution of the 16-year-old dropouts in the New Orleans sample is compared with the distribution in the Flint sample.

	Grade at Which Student Left School (16-year-old dropouts)							
	6th	7th	8th	9th	10th	11th	12th	Total
New Orleans	3	16	9	12	8	5	1	54
Flint			5	23	40	30	1	99

Since the inclusive ages of the state compulsory education laws that govern attendance in Flint and New Orleans are comparable, a child entering the first grade at age 6 in either city would, with normal progression, either complete the 10th grade or enter the 11th by age 16. Thus, one can appreciate the "dislike of school experience" reason for leaving school that was given by most of the New Orleans 16-year-old boys in the sample, for as the preceding tabulation shows, about 80 percent of them were in classes with children from two to eight years younger than themselves. However, their counterparts in Flint expressed the same dissatisfaction as they left school. In Flint, as the tabulation indicates, well over half of the boys in the sample were in a grade appropriate to their age when they dropped out. From this, it appears that a student who decides to leave school perceives his academic inadequacies whether or not they are dramatized by his age relationship to his classmates and the classroom environment.

One would suspect that these students, who hold strong feelings regarding their school experience, would leave at the earliest opportunity within the provisions of the attendance laws. Numerous school officials and teachers in the field study locations reported, "these kids who want out count the days until they're sixteen and take off the minute they pass the compulsory age." However, information developed in these studies indicated that there is a considerable tendency for a dropout to remain in school for some time after the legal age constraint on attendance

is no longer applicable. Since the New Orleans and Flint data included information on last date of attendance, it was possible to develop information on the number of months each boy attended school after reaching his sixteenth birthday.

The "instant dropouts"--those who left within a month after their sixteenth birthdays--accounted for approximately 40 percent of the 16-year-old New Orleans dropouts studied; this proportion held true for both white and Negro school leavers. The picture was more favorable in Flint; there only about 25 percent of the 16-year-old male dropouts studied left school within a month of their birthdays. However, in New Orleans some boys remained for at least five months after their birthdays and some stayed up to nine months before leaving school; this group also comprised approximately 40 percent of the total leaving school during 1964-65 school year. And in Flint, almost half of those who left school at age 16 stayed on for at least five months after their birthdays before dropping out. (All of these dropouts left school at some point during the school year before the completion of the term; thus, none of these cases represent continuation in order to complete a grade in school.)

Why students who have indicated a negative attitude toward staying in school beyond the legal age continue for some time before leaving is difficult to explain. Had time permitted, depth interviewing of the individuals in the sample might have uncovered some of the answers. There were a few instances in which students remained until they obtained assurance of a steady job, but the number of such cases was insignificant. Aggressive counseling might well account for some of this temporary retention, and the appeal of the fall program of school activities and athletic events cannot be discounted as an influence in holding some students for at least three months of the school year.

Youth Employment

The work experience patterns of the dropouts in the sample surveys are different for each locale. In Cleveland, 40 of the 67 male dropouts in the sample had applied for and received work permits, and 70 percent of this number were still employed at the time the sample was taken. In contrast, only nine of the dropouts in the New Orleans sample had ever received work certificates, and only one individual in the group was working at the time the sample survey was conducted. (This individual was employed as a dishwasher in a cafeteria, receiving $36.00 for a 40-hour, six-day week.)

The work experience of the remaining eight dropouts in the New Orleans sample who had received work permits is in keeping with the general finding that jobs available to young people in the New Orleans area are low paying and temporary. The highest paying of these jobs--messenger--had returned $28.00 per week, and most of the other reported jobs had paid between 65 and 75 cents per hour for such work as delivering groceries, porter and sweeper, or bag boy.

The employment situation for those boys in the Flint sample has some of the characteristics of both Cleveland and New Orleans. As in the Cleveland sample, a good number of the Flint boys had some work experience; 27 of the 99 age-16 dropouts had records of approved work permit applications on file. However, like their New Orleans counterparts, these boys took jobs that, though not as low paying as in the Southern city, lasted only a few weeks at best. Work as bag boys--usually at about $1.20 per hour--accounted for close to half of the permits, and a considerable number were issued for work as car washers, where pay was solely on a commission basis. In some instances, work was associated with the community school program, assisting the director or serving as an official in community athletic programs.

The work experience of the boys in the Flint sample indicates that young persons can and do find work within the constraints of the labor laws and that their in- or out-of-school status does not affect their ability to find jobs. Whether or not they are satisfied with the type of work for which they are eligible is another matter. Although 16 of the Flint boys in the sample had worked at one or more jobs before they dropped out of school, only two of these obtained work permits after leaving school. This can hardly be attributed to a lack of job opportunities, since eleven boys in the sample who had never received a work permit while attending school obtained jobs after dropping out. Five of these apparently had continued in school until work arrangements were made, since their work permit dates followed within a day or two of their last day of school attendance. Furthermore, the jobs obtained by the latter group were about the same, in terms of pay and type of work, as those held by the group that worked only while attending school.

Juvenile Offenders and Offenses

Since most reports of juvenile bureau police activity do not include information regarding the school status of the juvenile offender, the sample surveys provide an indication of the degree to which dropouts have been or become involved with the law and whether a dropout's work status influences the degree of involvement. In the Cleveland sample, a systematic relationship did not appear between school withdrawal, employment or unemployment, and delinquency. Only 14 individuals--less than 20 percent of the 67 in the sample--had contact with the law that resulted in a judgment of delinquency, and 8 of these persons were either employed or had been working.

In contrast, the Flint situation at first glance appears grim; almost two-thirds of the sample of 99 dropouts appeared in the police files. However, it should be noted that these files cover every instance of individual contact with the police, and 23 of the 62 names found in the files involved only one contact, which in many cases occurred several years before the date of school withdrawal. Most of the boys in the Flint sample who had official contact with the police were not involved with the law after leaving school; only 20 of the 62 individuals had records that included contacts after the date of school withdrawal--and 15 of these

showed a series of offenses, beginning while the boy was still in school. Thus, there were only five individuals in the sample group of 99 dropouts who had difficulty with the law only after they left school.

While 44 of the Flint dropouts with official police records had no more than three contacts, the remaining 18 individuals had records showing from 4 to 13 separate contacts with the juvenile bureau. Juvenile offenses by boys in this latter group fell into a definite pattern of offenses for each individual: the record of the boy with 13 contacts, for example, showed 10 separate cases of auto theft over a two-year period; another boy, who had a record of 8 contacts, was involved with the police on six different occasions for breaking and entering. The juvenile offenders with 7, 8, 9, and 10 police contacts had records of involvement with the law dating back to ages 12 or 13, ages at which they were attending school. In such cases as these, it seems safe to dismiss the possibility that restrictions in the juvenile labor laws had operated to any appreciable degree in influencing the delinquent behavior pattern.

Overall, the Flint sample fails to provide any evidence of a clear-cut relationship between work status and juvenile delinquency. Nine of the 16 individuals who had worked before leaving school had also been involved with the law before leaving school; and 7 of the 11 boys who worked after leaving school had some record of involvement with the police--before leaving school, after leaving school, or both. On the other hand, of the individuals who had never worked, 31 had been involved with the law before leaving school but 27 had had no police contact at any time.

In New Orleans, 24 of the 95 boys in the sample of the dropouts had juvenile records. Here, all but two of the boys had come to the attention of the juvenile authorities before leaving school, a situation not unlike that in the Flint sample. Also there were only two individuals in the New Orleans sample of 95 dropouts who first came into contact with the law after dropping out of school. Only three of these boys with juvenile records had ever received work permits, and these three had worked for only short periods at low paying jobs. However, while there were 21 boys who had never worked under permit and who had juvenile records, there were 65 boys who also had never worked but who had no police records. Thus, the New Orleans sample also suggests an absence of a relationship between labor laws and delinquent behavior.

Summary

Although these sample surveys point up differences among the three localities in the degree to which dropouts find employment, there are similarities that transcend the fact of geography. In general, the dropout who has a record of juvenile offenses comes in contact with the police well before he has withdrawn from school, and employment experience appears to make little difference when comparing offenders with nonoffenders. The dropout who gets into trouble with the law only after he has left school is relatively rare, and many dropouts, though unemployed, do not become police

problems. In view of this, it is difficult to support an hypothesis that suggests that the propensity for delinquent behavior among dropouts is heightened by the restrictive provisions of juvenile labor laws.

Winston-Salem Delinquents

In Winston-Salem, the juvenile division of the police department has developed a set of procedures for handling juvenile offenders that includes the preparation of a comprehensive General Information Report on each juvenile arrested for a misdemeanor or felony. A wide range of objective and descriptive information regarding the offender is recorded, including his appearance and attitude, school record, employment status, family, and home environment. Information about the offender's parents or guardian--age, occupation, employment status, education, community standing, personality, supervision--is also entered on this form, providing a substantial body of background information on the offender.

When the field study work was undertaken in Winston-Salem, these General Information Reports had been in use for a year. The entries for the 502 male cases on whom reports had been prepared during that period were tabulated, and the results provide considerable information about the characteristics of the juvenile offender population in this city.

Data on the regularity of school attendance covered 366 boys; of this number, approximately 80 percent were attending school regularly; 16 percent, irregularly; and 4 percent were classified as truants. Other entries that evaluated student progress and relationships with classmates and teachers covered practically all of the cases; these data showed that only about 10 percent of the offenders could be considered "problem" students--poor in effort, teacher and classmate relationships, and behavior. The remainder fell about evenly into either the "good" or "fair" rating categories in these assessments.

Most of these boys were listed as having many friends, but only six were noted to be members of gangs while 50 were associated with an organized group under school, church, or community sponsorship. Almost a third of these boys came from homes that received some measure of welfare support, and approximately two-thirds lived with a single parent, relative, or guardian. Nevertheless, most parents contacted expressed concern when informed of the offense, and only a handful were antagonistic toward the juvenile authorities.

Thirty of the boys were employed at the time of the offense; however, there was no indication of length of the employment or whether those who were not working had previous work experience. The majority of offenses were described by the police as arising from desire--thefts, shoplifting, and breaking and entering offenses. About 10 percent were listed as pranks, and twice that amount were classified as malicious acts. The police retained jurisdiction on 324 of the cases, since in this county only felony cases must be referred to the juvenile court for disposition,

and misdemeanors can be retained or referred to social agencies for action. Of the 324 boys handled at the juvenile police level, only 19 had subsequently become involved with the law as a result of further offenses.

Thus, in Winston-Salem one finds a situation in which delinquent behavior does not appear to be associated with inadequate school attendance and adjustment to the school situation. And the police case reports show no indication that a large number of the youth contacts had ever been employed.

Appendix

INSTRUCTIONS TO FIELD WORK TEAMS AND LISTING OF DATA TO BE COLLECTED

INSTRUCTIONS FOR FIELD WORK TEAMS

Step 1

Before departure for the site, send letters to major local officials and agency heads; these letters should include a description of the nature and background of the study and a listing of the kinds of information that are being sought. The letters should also request appointments for interviews and assistance in contacting appropriate persons and offices for the purposes of data collection.

Step 2

Interview major public officials and planning agencies dealing with socioeconomic problems (e.g., mayor, city manager, supervisors) to gain cooperation, acquire a broad overview of the local situation, and establish appropriate contacts with local agencies.

Step 3

Interview heads of major agencies who have responsibilities for youth problems, such as police department, sheriff's department, juvenile courts and probation departments, public school districts, welfare department, employment departments and offices, major delinquency and youth development projects, and appropriate state and federal agencies.

These officials should be interviewed with the same purposes as in Step 1, but the discussions should develop more detail in opinions and problems. Some documents and statistical reports may be collected at this level, but the major emphasis should be to determine specific sources of the various types of required information.

Step 4

Interview the persons indicated in Step 2 and begin data collection. This activity will usually involve work with the research and operating personnel of the major agencies, e.g., police juvenile officers, probation officers, school counseling and research personnel. At this point, the local team leader will adapt his data gathering activities to the local situation, working only within the data requirement framework.

LISTING OF DATA TO BE COLLECTED

Notes on Variables and Data To Be Collected

Due to the nature of the project, it is difficult to specify the variables to be taken under study in the manner usual in a more ordinary research approach. In broad terms the study will deal with, and attempt to interrelate, four general classes of variables:

I. Variables relating to legal constraints on school leaving by youths.

II. Variables relating to legal constraints on labor force entry by youths.

III. Variables relating to illegal behavior by youths (juvenile delinquency and youth offenses).

IV. Other such variables as may affect or influence variables in the first three classes, or mediate their interrelationships.

The following listings are not cast in the usual form or terminology of "variables." Rather they are descriptions of the types and classes of information that will be gathered in the course of the field studies. These data will in some cases be direct measures of a class of variable listed above. In most cases, however, they will be only partial or indirect measures that will be combined to form composite indices that will have construct validity as measures of the broader variable classes.

A. Data Relating to Laws and Other Legal Constraints

The same types of data will be collected for both compulsory school attendance laws and child labor laws; therefore, they are listed only once.

1. Basic minimum age laws (for all political levels that apply).

2. Policies of agencies and persons responsible for enforcement.

3. Bases for exceptions and waivers of legal constraints.

4. Numbers of requests or applications for waivers, by age, grade, reason, race, residence location.

5. Dispositions of requests, by above breakdowns.

6. Procedures used for enforcement of laws.

7. Numbers and types of personnel used in enforcement.

8. Changes in laws or policies 1960-65.

B. Data Relating to the Educational System and the School Attendance Behavior of Youths (Where Available, for the Years 1960-65)

1. Number of schools, locations, pupils, teachers.

2. Population of 12- to 18-year-olds, by grade.

3. Enrollment rates for 12- to 18-year-olds.

4. Attendance rates for 12- to 18-year-olds, by grade.

5. Numbers of institutionalized, retarded, or medically excused 12- to 18-year-olds, by age and grade.

6. Dropout rates, by age and grade.

7. Reasons for dropout (or nonattendance), by age and grade.

8. Academic performance records of dropouts (including attempted).

9. Rules and policies on reinstatement of dropouts.

10. Numbers of dropouts who return to school, by age and grade.

11. Counseling programs for pre- and post-dropouts.

12. Vocational training programs available to pre- and post-dropouts.

13. Continuation school programs available and/or required.

14. Other locally available programs for dropouts (e.g., youth camps).

C. Data on Labor Force Participation by Youth (All Data To Include Consideration of In-School/Out-of-School Status)

1. Labor force participation by 12- to 18-year-olds.
   a. Number of youths.
   b. Percent of age cohorts.
   c. Full-time, part-time participation rates.
   d. Types of employment.
   e. Income levels attained.

2. Employment services available to youths.

3. Unemployment levels of in-school and out-of-school youths.

4. Employment histories of youths.

5. The employment permit system of the locale.
   a. Regulations.
   b. Policies.
   c. Numbers of requests.
   d. Numbers granted.
   e. Reasons for grants/refusals.

6. Problems of placement of youths in employment.
   a. Employment services policies and attitudes.
   b. Availability of job opportunities for youth.
   c. Local employer attitudes.

D. Data Related to Criminal Behavior (All Data To Be by Age, Race, and Other Available Descriptive Breakdowns)

1. Crime rates (excepting traffic offenses), by ages and types of offenses.
   a. Arrests and police actions.
   b. Dispositions of arrests.
   c. Court actions--official and unofficial.
   d. Dispositions of court cases.

2. Educational and employment histories of juveniles coming to official attention of police or courts.

3. Outcomes of juvenile delinquency cases, where offender:
   a. Found/did not find useful employment.
   b. Returned to school/did not return.
   c. Neither/both.

4. Available descriptive data on juvenile cases and outcomes.

5. Juvenile law enforcement and court personnel (including probation, truancy, welfare, and other related services).

E. General Information Relative to the Locale

1. Overall population structure of the area, by age, sex, race, etc.
   a. Population data.
   b. Educational level.
   c. Labor force participation.
   d. Labor force structure.
   e. Unemployment.
   f. Urban/rural structure.
   g. Change--migration.
   h. Income information.

2. Overall socioeconomic description of the area.

3. Assessment of youth welfare services within the area.

4. Experience of youth services personnel with regard to school attendance, work, and crime by youths in the area.

STANFORD
RESEARCH
INSTITUTE

MENLO PARK
CALIFORNIA

Regional Offices and Laboratories

Southern California Laboratories
820 Mission Street
South Pasadena, California

Washington Office
808–17th Street, N.W.
Washington 6, D.C.

New York Office
270 Park Avenue, Room 1770
New York 17, New York

Detroit Office
1025 East Maple Road
Birmingham, Michigan

European Office
Pelikanstrasse 37
Zurich 1, Switzerland

Japan Office
c o Nomura Securities Co., Ltd.
1–1 Nihonbashidori, Chuo-ku
Tokyo, Japan

Representatives

Toronto, Ontario, Canada
Cyril A. Ing
Room 710, 67 Yonge St.
Toronto 1, Ontario, Canada

Milan, Italy
Lorenzo Franceschini
Via Macedonio Melloni, 49
Milano, Italy